This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

+ *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.

+ *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.

+ *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.

+ *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at `http://books.google.com/`

RADCLIFFE COLLEGE LIBRARY

THE GIFT OF

Florence H. Luscomb

WOMAN'S RIGHTS
COLLECTION

WOMAN AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
NEW YORK · BOSTON · CHICAGO
DALLAS · SAN FRANCISCO

MACMILLAN & CO., LIMITED
LONDON BOMBAY · CALCUTTA
MELBOURNE

THE MACMILLAN CO. OF CANADA, LTD.
TORONTO

Atwscomb

WOMAN *and* SOCIAL PROGRESS

A DISCUSSION OF THE BIOLOGIC, DOMESTIC, INDUSTRIAL, AND SOCIAL POSSIBILITIES OF AMERICAN WOMEN

BY

SCOTT NEARING, PH.D.

WHARTON SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA,

AUTHOR OF "SOCIAL ADJUSTMENT," ETC.

AND

NELLIE M. S. NEARING

B. A. BRYN MAWR, M. A. UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA

New York

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

1914

All rights reserved

106,799
Florence H. Lusscomb

COPYRIGHT, 1912,
BY THE MACMILLAN COMPANY.

Set up and electrotyped. Published May, 1912. Reprinted June, 1914.

394
H 22

Norwood Press:
Berwick & Smith Co., Norwood, Mass., U.S.A.

TO THE MANY GIRLS WHO HAVE COME TO US, UNCERTAIN, PERPLEXED, ASKING, "WHAT SHALL I DO?" THIS ANSWER IS DEDICATED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
Introduction—The American Woman		1
Part I.	Woman's Innate Capacity.	
I.	Woman,—an Individual	1
II.	Woman's Biologic Capacity	10
III.	The Personal Capacity of Woman	18
IV.	A Capacity Basis for Achievement	29
Part II.	Environmental Influences upon American Woman.	
	(a) The Revolution in the Home.	
V.	The Industrial Revolution	34
VI.	The Domestic Revolution	42
VII.	The New Leisure for Women	49
	(b) The Changing Social Environment.	
	(a) The Old Social Order.	
VIII.	Social Traditions	56
IX.	Masculine Dominance	69
X.	Marriage as a Trade	78
	(b) The New Social Environment.	
	(1) The Child Environment.	
XI.	The Home Training of the Girl	88
XII.	School Training	97
	(2) The Adult Environment.	
XIII.	College Education for Girls	106
XIV.	Training for Professions	115
XV.	Woman's Industrial Field	122

PAGE

PART III. THE OPPORTUNITIES BEFORE AMERICAN WOMEN.

(a) Self or Society,—A Fundamental Choice.

XVI. The Choice of the Women of Rome . . 128

XVII. The American Woman's Choice . . . 137

(b) Opportunity Through Eugenics.

XVIII. Selection,—a Basic Factor in Progress . . 147

XIX. Women as Selectors 161

(c) Domestic Opportunities.

XX. Women as Spenders 171

XXI. Domestic Science 177

XXII. Domestic Servants and Mothers' Helpers . 187

(d) Opportunities in Education.

XXIII. Child Training in the Home 196

XXIV. School Training 205

(e) Industrial Opportunities.

XXV. Women in Modern Industry 217

XXVI. The New Alignment of Industrial Occupations 225

XXVII. Women in Specific Employments . . . 231

(f) Opportunities for Coöperation Work.

XXVIII. Philanthropy 240

XXIX. The Social Significance of Women's Organizations 248

(g) Civic Opportunities.

XXX. Political Status of Women 256

PART IV. WOMEN AND THE FUTURE.

XXXI. Woman,—an Organic Social Factor . . 265

XXXII. Women and the Future 271

INTRODUCTION

THE AMERICAN WOMAN

"THE American Woman" and "The New Woman," phrases equally employed and misused, are in reality synonymous terms, connoting a woman who, breaking from the traditional activities of womankind, is turning to a new group of interests and occupations. The American Woman is unique. In England she is envied; on the Continent she is revered. Nowhere else in the world, except possibly in Australia, does her counterpart exist.

The distinctive position of the American Woman is the outcome of four factors:

1. Opportunity of education.
2. Freedom in choosing occupation.
3. Legal equality.
4. Abundance of leisure.

Because of these four advantages the American Woman is the first woman in the history of modern civilization who can "sass back" and make her "sass" good. Her father does not own her. Her husband may not kill her, sell her, or even beat her. She has been educated to believe that she is "as good as any man"; she has been sufficiently trained to be able to earn a living; she has numerous opportunities for

gainful employment; she is therefore self-reliant and economically independent.

If she chooses, on the other hand, to maintain a home, she is well fitted for her task. Equality, education and leisure place within her reach the possibility of becoming an effective homekeeper and a mother.

At all times, the occupational life of the American Woman may be a broad one. Before motherhood, and, if she does not elect to marry, through her whole adult life, she may pursue her chosen vocation, not stigmatized in any way for being a "working woman." The American Woman, as an independent human being, is presented with the opportunity to contribute, in many different spheres, her share toward Social Progress.

Many ignorant men and a few ignorant women still refer, with a curl of the lip, to "Woman's Sphere," —meaning those occupations involving the maintenance of a home, and the bearing and rearing of children. Having chosen to build battleships and mine coal, men assume the primal importance of these occupations. Upon due consideration, may it not appear that the development of high quality manhood and womanhood is, after all, one of the most important activities in which a nation may engage? Men have even concluded, because women could not build battleships, mine coal or make steel, that they were inferior to men. But wait! What part does the making of character and happiness play in the life of a nation?

Perhaps, indeed, the whole future of the Republic lies within the realm of "Woman's Sphere," for it is there that the new generation is born and reared. Speak of "Woman's Sphere" if you will, but speak reverently, for through it lies the door of the Future.

During the last century man's sphere has been clearly outlined. Man has become industrial. With his nose close to the grind-stone of daily occupation, he is devoting his energies to the production of income. Large-scale factories; high financiering; vast commercial operations; great industrial enterprises, appeal to a man. In adopting industry as his life work, he has co-ordinated his occupational activities with his inclination and capacity.

Unfortunately woman's position in modern society will not lend itself to so optimistic a statement. While man's activities for the next century are definitely determined, woman's activities are, on the contrary, a matter of great uncertainty. Woman's capacity is the great, undirected force in modern society. The sphere of domestic activity and motherhood is limited to married women, who constitute less than sixty per cent of the women fifteen years of age and over in the United States. The remainder—the girl before marriage, the woman who never marries, and the woman who, for some reason, is forced after marriage to earn her living—await direction in their occupational choices.

One-half of the race cannot efficiently do the work of the world; hence woman must contribute her moiety

to Social Progress. In order to make this contribution effective, some definite relation must be established between woman's capacity and her activity. Man, having chosen his sphere and centred his interests, remains comparatively indifferent to woman's dilemma. The co-ordination, therefore, between woman and her life activities must be made by the woman herself.

The American Woman facing this dilemma stands at the parting of the ways. The old world of subjection and dependence lies behind her; before her opens the new world of individual development and achievement. Her opportunities for training have never before been equalled; her opportunities for activity are daily enlarging. Foremost in opportunity, the American Woman may also stand foremost in achievement; but it is for her to define the scope of the contribution which she will make to Social Progress.

WOMAN AND SOCIAL PROGRESS

CHAPTER I

WOMAN—AN INDIVIDUAL

THE editors of a great encyclopedia inserted in their first edition, which appeared in the latter part of the eighteenth century, this definition of Woman: "Woman, the Female of man. See Man." Her attributes, capabilities, and powers were included in his—she was not an individual, but an attachment to an individual. For information about woman, there was but one source—man—"the fountain-head of all her being." In subscribing this heading the editors were interpreting the general thought of the age.

The contrast between this eighteenth-century English attitude toward woman and the twentieth-century American attitude is both striking and fundamental. For information about women to-day, we not only "See Woman," but we actually quote her. "By a woman," writes Miss Cicely Hamilton, "I understand an individual human being, whose life is her own concern." "To me she is an entity in herself; and if, on meeting her for the first time, I inquire whether or no she is married, it is only because I wish to know whether I am to address her as Mrs. or Miss."[1]

[1] "Marriage as a Trade," Cicely Hamilton, New York, Moffat, Yard & Co., 1909, pp. 2 and 3.

The bachelor girl, then, is not a failure because she is unattached; she fails only when she ceases to be a woman.

A woman, in twentieth-century America, is looked upon as a complete physical and mental organism, which can exist and function without the active aid of man. The American Woman is an individual. Her capacities, attributes and powers are her own—to be employed and used by her as she in her freedom of choice, may elect. This transformation of Woman, from a male attachment into an individual being with free choice, removes her from the slough of contumely and oblivion in which she struggled so long, and places her in the line of evolutionary progress.

The objective point of evolution, if evolution can be said to have an objective point, seems to be an individual of high type. Among the lower forms of life, the individual disappears in the mass. As the higher forms of animal life are approached, the individual enjoys an increasing period of protected youth; until among men, the offspring is carefully guarded against the possibility of harm during a period ranging, in civilized society, from ten to twenty-five years. A contrast with savagery and barbarism shows that civilization is a process of lengthening youth. Long youth means long life. The prolongation of youth results in greater individualization. Hence civilized man, the supreme product of the ages, is more intensely individualized than any other being.

The race, superficially regarded, might be placed before the individual, yet when the individual is considered in his true light—as handing down tendencies and characteristics from one generation to the next, the race appears only as a continuous aggregation of individuals. "The race or species becomes an ideal, an abstract conception, and the individual the only thing that is real."[1] In such terms nineteenth-century philosophy and science express their great contribution to modern thought—the individual is all important; the individual is the race.

For the most part, however, the individual which these men had in mind was not an individual member of society but an individual man. Woman in the nineteenth-century scheme of things was popularly disregarded; even to-day the commonly accepted view makes the individual man the centre of the universe, and places woman in a secondary position. Appearing in the form of social and sociologic theories, this concept becomes the view "that all things centre . . . about man, and that woman, though necessary to the work of reproduction, is only a means of continuing the human race, but is otherwise an unimportant accessory, and incidental factor in the general result."[2] Were this assumption correct, a study of society and of social forces would consist, as it has in all historic times, in an analysis of the doings of

[1] "Pure Sociology," Lester F. Ward, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1903, p. 291.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 292.

men only, since woman, apart from her reproductive function, could not be expected to take any share in directing Social Progress.

During the past few decades, however, individualism has advanced from the discovery of the individual man to the discovery of the individual woman. Woman herself has not been content with her position of alleged inferiority; neither were those scientists who viewed the subject in its broadest phases content to leave her there.

Perhaps her apparent inferiority was the product of her inferior position in the past. It was while working on such a hypothesis that John Stuart Mill penned his essay on the Subjection of Women, and Lester F. Ward wrote the epoch-making chapter fourteen of his "Pure Sociology," in which he clearly shows that the apparent inferiority of women is the result of age-long subjection. This subjection, "a pure product of human reason, untempered by altruistic sentiments," has persisted since the evolution of man's reasoning faculty told him that, being the stronger physical organism, he could use woman for the gratification of his passions, and force her to do his work. The opening of this epoch of woman's subjection is thus described by Ward—"In our long . . . journey down the stream of time we have now reached the darkest spot, and fain would I omit its description were this not to leave a blank in the story." Then follows this well known quotation from Herbert Spencer—"In the history of humanity as written, the

saddest part concerns the treatment of women; and had we before us its unwritten history we should find this part still sadder. I say the saddest part because, though there have been many things more conspicuously dreadful—cannibalism, the torturings of prisoners, the sacrificings of victims to ghosts and gods—these have been but occasional; whereas the brutal treatment of woman has been universal and constant," and "almost beyond imagination."

"The general fidelity of this picture," comments Ward, "cannot be questioned, but . . . I must protest against the term 'brutal' as characterizing the treatment of woman by man. Far too many human sins are attributed to the brute that still lurks in man, but in this case it is flagrantly unjust to do this, since no male brute maltreats the female, and the abuse of females by males is an exclusively human virtue."[1]

Woman's subject position in the past is therefore due to the physical dominance of man. Woman's inferiority, says Condorcet, "has had no other origin than the abuse of power" by men. The inferiority of women to men who ill used and enslaved them may, in reality, be no greater than the inferiority of the Early Christians to Nero and to Pretorians, who threw them to the lions.

Man, however, seeks to justify his dominance. In literature, in poetry, in science, he urges his prerogatives. "The Mohametan, for instance, after careful

[1] *Supra*, pp. 346-7.

observation from his point of view, decided that she was flesh without a soul. . . . The early fathers of the church, who were in the habit of giving troubled and nervous consideration to the subject, denounced her at spasmodic intervals as sin personified."[1] An excellent example of this denunciation appears in "The Witch Hammer" a fifteenth-century book, published with the sanction of Pope Innocent VIII. After citing the temptations of Solomon by women, the book continues: "Since she was formed of a crooked rib, her entire spiritual nature has been distorted and inclined more toward sin than virtue."[2] Chrysostom, one of the fathers of the early Church, is quoted as saying: "What is woman but an enemy of friendship, an unavoidable punishment, a necessary evil, a natural temptation, a desirable affliction, a constantly flowing source of tears, a wicked work of nature covered with a shining varnish."[3]

The picture is rounded out by a remark attributed to Tiberius Gracchus: "If we could do without wives, we should be rid of that nuisance; but since nature has decreed that we can neither live comfortably with them nor live at all without them we must even look rather to our permanent interests than to a passing pleasure."[4]

[1] "Marriage as a Trade," Cicely Hamilton, New York, Moffat, Yard & Co., 1909, p. 11.

[2] "Pure Sociology," Lester F. Ward, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1903, p. 365.

[3] *Idem.*

[4] "Social Life at Rome," W. W. Fowler, New York, Macmillan Co., 1909, p. 150.

In literature the same denunciation of woman appears. Andrew McPhail, a modern essayist, writes: "A man expects very little of a woman, nothing more than that she shall willingly receive kindness at his hands, that she will permit herself to be loved."[1] Nietzsche expresses the same view even more strongly. "Let woman be a toy, pure and delicate like a jewel." "Man's happiness is: 'I will.' Woman's happiness is: 'He will.'" "Thou goest to women? Remember thy whip!" "Women are still always cats and birds, or, in the best case, cows."[2]

Scientists compare men and women as to their physical characteristics, their mental attributes and their moral qualities. They find that men can lift a greater number of pounds of lead, that they have a broader capacity for generalization, and a keener sense of justice than women. All of which being proved, the scientist concludes, ridiculously enough, that men are "better" than women, or that they are "superior" to women. Pray, why not conclude that the sunrise is more beautiful than the sunset, because it comes first; or that the peacock is more beautiful than the bird of paradise, because it is larger. Just as all roads lead to Rome, so all arguments lead to the conclusion that men are the superior and women the inferior creatures.

Not only are such deductions unjustified by

[1] "Essays in Fallacy," Andrew McPhail, New York, Longmans, Green & Co., 1910, p. 49.

[2] "Thus Spake Zarathustra," F. Nietzsche, "Of a Friend," and "Little Women Old and Young."

the data on which they are based, but all comparisons between the sexes are obviously futile. Even the scientists agree to disagree among themselves. Havelock Ellis, after an exhaustive analysis of the entire subject,[1] concludes that men depart farther from the normal than women, hence men are more variable; but Professor Karl Pearson, after a thorough discussion of the same subject,[2] decides that women vary more than men. The whole discussion is similar to that oft quoted high school debate, "Which is more useful, gold or iron," or that no less grotesque subject "Resolved that Washington was a greater man than Lincoln." Both "useful" and "great" are relative terms and withal so elastic and meaningless that neither connotes any definite concept. Exactly the same thing holds true of the statements regarding the relative "goodness," "superiority" or "importance" of men and women. One might with equal facility refer to the usefulness of gold versus iron; the greatness of Washington versus Lincoln; or the genius of a painter versus that of a poet. Men and women are different. Certain characteristics are more strongly marked in men than in women; certain others are more strongly marked in women than in men; but concepts of "better" or "worse," "superior" or "inferior" are, as Havelock Ellis puts it, "absolutely futile

[1] "Man and Woman," Havelock Ellis, London, Scott Pub. Co., 4th Ed., 1904, Ch. 16.

[2] "Chances of Death," Karl Pearson, London, Edward Arnold, 1897, Vol. I, pp. 375-6.

and foolish." Hence they have no place in our discussion.

In this discussion of Woman and Social Progress, we are not at all concerned with the relation of woman's capacity to man's, but with the relation of her capacity to her opportunities and to her achievement. If it can be shown that women have capacity, it matters not a whit whether that capacity be equal to man's, inferior, or superior. If women have capacity; if they are capable of achievement; then they can, as individuals, play a part in the drama of life. The world abounds in work, a great deal of which will not be done at all unless it is done by women. If it can be shown that women have capacity for work, every relation of social justice and every need of Social Progress demand that this opportunity and this capacity be correlated in such a manner as to insure women's achievement. In the succeeding chapters we shall attempt to prove that women's capacity, if combined with opportunity, will necessarily result in achievement; that, therefore they should take their places as individuals in the vanguard of an advancing civilization.

CHAPTER II

WOMAN'S BIOLOGIC CAPACITY

WOMAN'S Capacity for assisting in Social Progress may be stated in terms of her biologic capacity—that is, her capacity as a living member of the human species; or it may be stated in terms of her personal capacity—that is, her capacity as an individual member of society. Biologically, woman is one unit in the race of man, receiving from the past, and transmitting to the future, the life and the race characteristics with which she is endowed. Personally, woman is an Individual Member of a social group, surrounded by institutions and traditions—living as an integral part of the society into which she is born.

What is the character of Woman's Biologic and Personal Capacity? Biologically, "the female not only typifies the race but metaphor aside she IS the race," writes Lester F. Ward in the most significant of all his books.[1] Looked at therefore, from a racial standpoint, woman occupies a position of supreme importance to Social Progress. Since she is the race, she

[1] "Pure Sociology," Lester F. Ward, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1903, p. 322.

determines the race characteristics that shall be transmitted to the future.[1]

Each generation is born anew—born to women. While it must accept the social institutions which it discovers, modifying them as best it may to fulfil its purposes, the generation comes into the world with certain characteristics which are typical of the race to which that generation belongs. If the modern biologists are not in error, the female transmits a majority of these race characteristics.

There are certain elements persistent in every race. Although Ripley's "Races of Europe" throws discredit on the old theory of superior and inferior races, it clearly points to the prevalence of certain characteristics which typify a racial group. For example, our Teutonic ancestors were fair-haired and blue-eyed, tall and long-headed. In direct contrast were the Italians —brunettes, short and round-headed. Though these superficial race characteristics are far less significant than such fundamental qualities as aggressiveness, co-operative capacity, the instinct for democracy, they nevertheless indicate the nature of race differences. The really fundamental racial qualities cannot be measured or compared at all, yet their presence or absence determines the ascendancy or decadence of the race in question. These racial qualities, whether superficial or fundamental, are contributed to the

[1] For a very emphatic, though somewhat unscientific statement of this problem, see "Woman and Womanhood," C. W. Saleeby, New York, Kennerley, 1911.

race primarily by woman. The far-reaching consequences of this statement warrant some elaboration.

The most primitive forms of biologic life are perpetuated asexually—there is neither male nor female. The cells increase by "budding" or "division." Among slightly higher forms of life, the creature has within itself both the fertilized (female) and the fertilizing (male) elements. Throughout the lower forms of life "The female is the fertile sex, and whatever is fertile is looked upon as female. . . . Biologists have proceeded from this popular standpoint and regularly speak of 'mother cells' and 'daughter cells.' It therefore does no violence to language or to science to say that life begins with the female organism and is carried on a long distance by means of females alone. . . . In a word, life begins as female. The female sex, which existed from the beginning, continues unchanged, but the male sex, which did not exist at the beginning, makes its appearance at a certain stage. . . . There are probably many more living beings without it than with it. . . . The female is not only the primary and original sex, but continues throughout as the main trunk. The male . . . is a mere afterthought of nature. Moreover, the male sex was at first for a long period, and still is, throughout many of the lower orders of beings, devoted exclusively to the function for which it was created, viz. that of fertilization. Among millions of humble creatures the male is simply and solely a fertilizer."[1]

[1] *Supra*, pp. 313-14.

Thus among the lower orders of life, the female is the only creature; a little further on bisexualism replaces asexualism, but the female remains the dominant factor. . . . "In insects generally the males are smaller than the females. . . . There are many species and even genera belonging to different orders, in which the male, usually smaller and more slender, is either not provided with any functional organs for eating, or has these so imperfectly developed that it seems improbable that it succeeds in sustaining life beyond the period that the nourishment stored up in the larval state will continue it."[1] The female, in the lower forms of life, is either alone in her glory or else dominant. The more highly evolved forms of life show the male larger and stronger than the female, yet even here the female is still the race. The male has entered the field; he may be larger; he may have a sweeter voice or a prettier coat; but it is to the female that nature looks for race conservation.

The human species constitutes no exception to the general rule of the primal nature of the female. "With each generation the entire human race passes through the body of its womanhood as through a mold, reappearing with the indelible marks of that mold upon it. . . . The intellectual capacity, the physical vigor, the emotional depth of woman, form also an untranscendable circle, circumscribing with each successive generation the limits of the expansion of the human

[1] *Supra*, p. 217.

race."[1] The female is biologically dominant. Woman is the race. Can it then be shown that the success or failure of a race varies with the success or failure of its women?

There are several important elements in woman's contribution to race progress that stand out very clearly:

1. Woman is nearer to race type than man.
2. She is less specialized than man.
3. She is biologically more conservative than man.

The successful demonstration of these three points will prove beyond cavil that we must look to woman primarily for the biologic qualities of the Super Man and the Super Race.

What is the race type? The processes of evolution seem to be working toward a human creature with a large brain, a small face, round trunk, weak limbs and delicate bones—a hairless creature, almost perfectly typified by the human infant. The adult man is very far from human race type. It is a gross mistake to assume that adult development and evolutionary perfection are synonymous. In fact the adult human male is biologically "a trifle senile, if not decadent."[2] This senility comes only with maturity. There is little apparent difference between the intellectual capacity of the children of different races, but a marked intellectual difference among the

[1] "Woman and Labor," Olive Schreiner, New York, F. A. Stokes Co., 1911, pp. 130-1.

[2] "Adolescence," G. Stanley Hall, New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1904, Vol. II, p. 561.

adults of these races.[1] Furthermore, men of genius approximate to the child type. "The Greeks were always children," and they were frequently geniuses. Thus the child type is the race type, and clearly represents the goal of organic evolution.[2]

And Woman? She is a close approximation to the child. "She bears the special characteristics of humanity in a higher degree than man. . . . She represents, more nearly than man, the human type to which man is approximating."[3] The child, holding to the race type, gives an indication of the probable line of development of the human race. Woman, very unspecialized, and hence near to the child type, is nearer to race type, and more typical of the race-evolution of the future.

Stated differently, woman is, from the race standpoint, less specialized than man. If it were possible to draw a line, representing normality, women would vary less from the line than men. There would be fewer geniuses and fewer defectives among women. The woman, less highly developed, that is, nearer to the race type, possesses less of the peculiar characteristics, whether for good or for evil, which characterize men.[4]

[1] "Man and Woman," Havelock Ellis, London, Scott Pub. Co., Fourth Edition, 1904, pp. 445-7.

[2] *Ibid.*, Chapter XVIII.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 447.

[4] "Man and Woman," Havelock Ellis, London, Scott Pub. Co., Fourth Edition, 1904. Chapter XVI. An excellent discussion of the relative variability of men and women.

Since women are less specialized they are more conservative. That is, they have more of a tendency to adhere to the past, and less inclination to branch out in new directions. Havelock Ellis observes "in women, as in females generally, an organic tendency to stability and conservatism."[1] After discussing at some length the variation of the male, Ward writes—"Females cannot thus vary. They represent the centre of gravity of the biological system. They are that 'stubborn power of permanency' of which Goethe speaks."[2] G. Stanley Hall quotes with approval the statements of W. K. Brooks that women are "devoted to keeping what has been acquired by successive generations as new layers of snow are added to glaciers. . . . Her mind is more than that of man, essentially an organ of heredity."[3] Women conserve the characteristics of the race and transmit them through heredity to the future generations.

From an evolutionary standpoint the female necessarily represents the characteristics of the race. "A species in which the maternal half exhibited a general inferiority of vital functions could scarcely survive."[4] Negatively this is true. Without a dominant womanhood, race progress would be impossible. Positively,

[1] *Supra*, p. 425.

[2] "Pure Sociology," L. F. Ward, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1903, p. 322-3.

[3] "Adolescence," G. Stanley Hall, New York, Appleton & Co., 1908, Vol. II, p. 567.

[4] "Man and Woman," Havelock Ellis, London, Scott Pub. Co., Fourth Ed., 1904, p. 449.

woman "is at the top of the human curve from which the higher superman of the future is to evolve. . . . Her whole soul, conscious and unconscious, is best conceived as a magnificent organ of heredity."[1]

Again, we write, "Woman is the race." She is less specialized, hence nearer to race type, more typical of the race, and therefore prepared to transmit to future generations the characteristics of the race to which she belongs. To women primarily the race must look for its biologic progress. Whether she wills it or not, the responsibility is cast upon her shoulders, because she is female rather than male. Conserving as she does the qualities which have been developed and handed down from the past, she is prepared, far more fully than the male, to transmit these qualities to the future.

[1] "Adolescence," G. S. Hall, New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1908, pp. 561-2.

NOTE.—Some biologists carry the doctrine of female importance so far as to maintain that femaleness is maleness plus something. "The evidence for this view," writes Professor Thomas H. Montgomery, Jr., "comes from the study of the germ cells of a number of different animals in which it has been shown, as a rule, that when there is a difference in the number of chromosomes in egg cells and sperm cells, the number is generally less in the sperm cells. For these reasons one may well regard male individuals as female individuals lacking certain qualities."

CHAPTER III

THE PERSONAL CAPACITY OF WOMAN

BIOLOGICALLY, Woman plays a unique part in race progress. Personally, her capacity for Social Progress, though far less unique, is quite distinctive.

Physically women have certain definitely marked characteristics. In stature, lifting strength, strength of arms and legs, and cranial capacity, they are decidedly inferior to men. Havelock Ellis thus characterizes woman's physique as compared to man's: "The man is larger, with certain tendency to rugged though not unbeautiful outline which conveys an impression of energy; his bony prominences are usually more conspicuous, and his muscles are everywhere more clearly defined. The woman is smaller and more delicately made; the bony points are less clearly seen, and the muscles, even although they may be powerful, are softly encased in abundant connective tissue which makes them less obvious. The man's form is erect and closely knit; the woman's is more uneven, with large hips and flowing protuberant curves of breast and abdomen and flanks. While the man's form seems to be instinctively seeking action, the woman's falls naturally into a state of comparative

repose, and seems to find satisfaction in an attitude of overthrow."[1]

For heavy lifting and carrying, woman is really unfitted physically (though how far this is due to hereditary characteristics, and how far to the lack of legitimate exercise is still an open question).[2] A collection of scientific data relative to the keenness of sense perception (touch, sight, smell and hearing) leads to no definite conclusions. Apparently, there are no marked sexual differences in the sense capacity of women and men.[3] But for intellectual work, which is the really important occupation of modern society, woman may be as well fitted as man. Certainly the size of her head has little or nothing to do with the problem. "Popularly, a large head with beetling eyebrows suffices to establish a man's intellectual credit; but like all other credit, it is entirely dependent on what lies upon deposit elsewhere. Neither size nor weight of the brain seems to be of importance."[4]

Women, therefore, possess a definite quota of measurable physical capacity. They can lift, carry, walk; they have all of the ordinary organs required for physical exertion, beside the brain convolutions necessary for thought and decision.

[1] "Man and Woman," Havelock Ellis, London, W. Scott, Ltd., 1897, pp. 31-2.

[2] "Woman's Share in Primitive Culture," Otis F. Mason, New York, Appleton, 1900, Chap. VI.

[3] "Man and Woman," Havelock Ellis, London, Scott Pub. Co., Fourth Ed., 1904. Chap. VI.

[4] "The Races of Europe," Wm. Z. Ripley, New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1899, p. 43

The objective measures of physical capacity—longevity, vitality, and endurance—are possessed by women to a marked degree. Although, in the United States 105 boys are born to every 100 girls, after the first two years there are more girls alive than boys. All available statistics show a greater length of life among women than among men.[1]

The remarkably high vitality of women is evinced by their ability to withstand severe surgical operations and to resist the effects of disease. On the whole, women are less liable to most diseases than are men.[2] G. Stanley Hall thus summarizes woman's vitality in comparison to man's—"He is more prone than she to rheumatism, cancer, brain troubles, sudden death from internal or external causes, can less survive severe surgical operations and grows old more rapidly; his hair is gray earlier and he is more prone to loss of sight, hearing, memory, senile irritability, to deformities and anomalies, is less hardy and less resembles children."[3] The vitality of women is therefore comparatively very great.

Women are capable of great endurance. Man is a more specialized instrument for motion, quickness on his feet, with a longer reach, and fitted for bursts of energy; while woman has a greater fund of stored

[1] "National Vitality," Irving Fisher, 61st Congress, Second Session, Senate Doc. 419, 1910, pp. 16 and 18.

[2] "Man and Woman," Havelock Ellis, London, Scott Pub. Co., Fourth Ed., p. 449.

[3] "Adolescence," G. S. Hall, New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1908, Vol. II, p. 563.

energy and is consequently more fitted for endurance. This capacity for endurance is of peculiar importance because of the recent development of specialization, particularly in industry where it is no longer necessary to master an entire trade. Apprenticeship has been replaced by short-term "learning." A girl who enters the factory to-day can, in the course of a few weeks, or at most a few months, become thoroughly acquainted with all of the duties connected with her particular task. After she has learned, it is endurance rather than skill that counts. This is true, not only of industry, but of scientific work as well. "In many of the new fields opening in biology, in embryology, botany, the study of children, animals, savages, sociological investigation, to say nothing of all the vast body of work that required painstaking detail, perseverance, and conscience, woman has superior ability."[1]

In short, the development of the past century has opened up great reaches of opportunity, which are in every way adapted to the special aptitudes of women. Science and invention have thus paved the way. To follow the lines of activity opened by these new scientific developments, women have a definite physical capacity which expresses itself primarily in longevity, vitality and endurance, a triune of survival qualities which are indispensable in the modern struggle for recognition.

Thus women have a physical capacity which will

[1] *Supra*, pp. 634-5.

enable them to do their part of the world's work. Can the same be said of their mental ability?

Neither head-size nor brain weight are important factors, since scientific opinion emphasizes the quality rather than the quantity of brain tissue. In so far as any judgment may be made regarding women's mental capacity, G. Stanley Hall writes: "Woman has rapid tact in extricating herself from difficulties; girls speak quicker than boys, old women are likely to be talkative, old men glum; men progress most after graduation; women are very prone to lose accomplishments and special culture and training, are more punctual in school and college, more regular in attendance and in higher grades have the best marks, but vary less from the average; they excel in mental reproduction rather than in production; are superior in arts of conversation, more conservative and less radical; their vasomotor system is more excitable, they are more emotional, blush and cry easier; are more often hypnotized; quicker to take suggestions, have most sympathy, pity, charity, generosity, and superstitions."[1] There seems to be little question of the marked capacity of women to memorize quickly,[2] but as to the breadth of their mental grasp there is considerable dispute. For the minutia of intellectual work, they have a peculiar aptitude; "woman excels in quick apprehension of wholes;"[3]

[1] "Adolescence," G. S. Hall, New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1908, Vol. II, p. 566.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 620.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 565.

but the capacity for abstractly planning large enterprises is apparently lacking in the feminine mind. "Abstract thought in women seems usually to be marked by a certain docility and receptiveness." Women lack initiative and aggressiveness in enforcing their abstractions. I think we may agree that, as Burdach said long ago, "women take truth as they find it, while men want to create truth. . . . It is difficult to recall examples of women who have patiently and slowly fought their way at once to perfection and to fame in the face of complete indifference, like, for instance, Balzac. . . . It is still more difficult to recall a woman who for any abstract and intellectual end, has fought her way to success through obloquy and contempt, or without reaching success, like a Roger Bacon, or a Galileo, a Wagner or an Ibsen."[1]

Men ordinarily reach judgments through logic: women through intuition.[2] The former method is deliberate, the latter agile. Undoubtedly the masculine method of thought is better suited to the construction and maintenance of a great industrial enterprise, but on the other hand, the woman's intuitive grasp of situations enables her to understand more readily both situations and people.

Achievement in the fields demanding peculiarly high intellectual power,—art, literature, music, drama, scientific discovery, invention,—has in the past been confined almost wholly to men, although a few women

[1] "Man and Woman," H. Ellis, London, Scott Pub. Co., 1897, p. 185-6.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 174.

have won universal recognition. George Eliot, and George Sand, Rosa Bonheur and Mrs. Browning have acquired international fame through their creative work. It nevertheless remains generally true that the art, literature, discoveries and achievements of the nineteenth century were in almost all cases masculine. The cause of this absence of the feminine in constructive achievement will be discussed in the following chapter. Its truth is obvious.

Thus, in those mental processes which require quick perception, women excel, while in the fields demanding bold, constructive thought, men dominate. If our analysis in the preceding chapter was correct—if men vary more from race type than women, this dominance of man in the field of constructive intellectual work is exactly what might have been anticipated.

Turning now to the third field of activity, the field to which, for want of a better word, the term "metaphysical" has been applied, we find women occupying a peculiarly significant position. To physical capacity and mental grasp women add a remarkable development of sympathy, intuition and insight into situations chapter. The facts are obvious.

After discussing at length the past subjection of women, Olive Schreiner writes:—"We have no certain proof that it is so at present: but, if woman's long years of servitude and physical subjection, and her experience as child-bearer and protector of infancy, should, in any way, be found in the future to have endowed her, as a kind of secondary sexual charac-

teristic, with any exceptional width of human sympathy and any instinctive comprehension; then, in the ages that are coming, woman as woman, and by right of that wherein she differs from the male, will have an all-important part to play in the activity of the race."[1]

The existence of this quality of sympathy is recognized by Ward, who writes that the relation of the female to her offspring gave to the human race its first touch of sympathy, which "though in itself an entirely different faculty, early blended with, or helped to create, the derivative reason-born faculty of altruism."[2] Through the development and expansion of this sympathy—altruism early results in a recognition of woman's metaphysical capacity. "It is peculiar and significant that everywhere and always she has been tacitly credited with a certain mysterious power of which the world has, as it were, stood in awe and fear. While perpetually proclaiming her inferiority, insignificance, and weakness, it has by its precautions virtually recognized her potential importance and real strength."[3] One of the latest manifestations of the world's attitude toward this problem appears in the witch burnings which persisted even in Colonial America.

The intuition, or insight, so peculiar to women, results in decisions, not based on logic, which are remarkably unerring. A business man said to me

[1] "Woman and Labor," O. Schreiner, New York, F. A. Stokes Co., 1911, pp. 224-27.

[2] "Pure Sociology," L. F. Ward, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1903, p. 424.

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 369.

recently: "I never enter into a serious business relation, without taking home to dinner the man with whom I am dealing, in order to secure my wife's opinion of him. The only time I didn't do that, I suffered a very severe financial loss, which taught me a lesson that I shall not soon forget." Here is one instance of the frank recognition, by a keen business man, of the superior worth of a woman's intuitive judgment of an unknown situation.

Perhaps the most significant phase of the whole subject of woman's personal capacity is her power of inspiration. The thought has been so misused, and degraded that one mentions it hesitatingly, yet rightly treated it represents a deeply significant concept.

When cases of doubt arise, the French at once say, *"Cherchez la femme"* (Look for the woman). An investigation will show a remarkably broad field to which this principle will apply. It has been true that up to this point in the world's history, creative work has been largely done by men, yet a careful reading of biography will show behind almost every great man an inspiring woman. Though Galton writes of genius ("Hereditary Genius," Francis Galton) as if it were the product of heredity from father to son, a careful study of the lives of Galton's geniuses shows the dominant influence of many women. Indeed, Galton himself recognizes this truth. "It therefore appears to be very important to success in science, that a man should have an able mother."[1] The best of poetry, the

[1] "Hereditary Genius," Francis Galton, New and Revised Edition, New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1879, p. 196.

noblest of art and literature, even the achievements of science and industry seem to be animated in a marked degree by women. The work was masculine, the constructor was a man, but the motive power behind the man who built was a woman. Prosaically enough G. Stanley Hall remarks: "Women must be stewardesses of the mysteries of appropriate human life, so that aspiration for its adornments be not arrested. Men are weak in spiritual elements which college women may enforce."[1]

Perhaps Ruskin is right in his analysis of the relation of women to the world's progress. After describing the power of Shakespeare's and Scott's women, the Egyptians who "gave to their spirit of wisdom the form of a woman," the Athena of the Greeks "to whose faith you owe, down to this date, whatever you hold most precious in art, in literature, or in types of national virtue," Ruskin continues: "I will ask you whether it can be supposed that these men, in the main work of their lives, are amusing themselves with a fictitious and idle view of the relations between man and woman;—nay, worse than fictitious or idle; for a thing may be imaginary yet desirable, if it were possible; but this, their ideal of women, is, according to our common idea of the marriage relation, wholly undesirable. The woman, we say, is not to guide, nor even to think, for herself. The man is always to be the wiser, he is to be the thinker, the ruler, the superior

[1] "Adolescence," G. S. Hall, New York, D. Appleton Co., 1908, Vol. II, p. 583.

in knowledge and discretion, as in power. Is it not somewhat important to make up our minds on this matter? Are all these great men mistaken, or are we? Are Shakespeare and Æschylus, Dante and Homer, merely dressing dolls for us; or, worse than dolls, unnatural visions, the realization of which, were it possible, would bring anarchy into all households and ruin into all affections?"[1]

[1] "Sesame and Lilies," John Ruskin.

CHAPTER IV

A CAPACITY BASIS FOR ACHIEVEMENT

If the analyses in the three preceding chapters are correct; if it is true that biologically and personally, women possess marked, and in some particulars, even unique capacity; then there exists in women a power which, coupled with opportunity, assures them a part in the world's achievement.

Both capacity and opportunity are necessary for achievement. Thomas A. Edison, living on an island in the South Pacific, without the appliances of modern society, could not duplicate his industrial triumphs. The opportunity to work is no less necessary than the capacity for work. Both definitely limit achievement.

Achievement is of primary importance. Our measures of men are of necessity made in terms of achievement. We think of Michael Angelo in terms of Art, of Shelley in terms of Poetry. Michael Angelo and Shelley might have lived their lives in Labrador and been unheard of, but because one lived in artistic Italy and the other in liberty-loving England, they made an impress on the thought of the world.

This statement is no less true of women than it is of men. "Women have taken little part in the history of the race," you protest. True they have not even writ-

ten about it. If they had, history might read differently. History, as written, is a record of masculine achievement,—wars, battles, intrigues and dynasties constitute the great bulk of historic data. In these, it is true, the women played little part.

Neither have women made literature, nor painted, nor carved, nor discovered, nor invented. But was opportunity open to them? What has been the position of women during the last ten centuries?

With but few exceptions, since the dawn of human intellect, women have apparently been in subjection—physically, politically and socially. Some boys were born into a world of achievement, but all girls were born into a world of subjection. From their cradles they were taught their subject position—taught in terms that permitted of no gainsaying. Women must obey; must conform; must follow the precepts laid down by men.

Is it true that men have broader mental reach, and that they think more fully? We can arrive at a tentative conclusion by analyzing history. Yet historical analysis is necessarily inconclusive because, while our basis of judgment in history is achievement, women have been denied, throughout historic epochs, any opportunity which might lead them to achieve.

That women can and do achieve in the presence of opportunity is affirmed by Ward, who writes: "The universal prevalence of the androcentric world view, shared by men and women alike, acts as a wet blanket on all the genial fire of the female sex. We have no

conception of the real amount of talent or of genius possessed by women. It is probably not greatly inferior to that of men even now, and a few generations of enlightened opinion on the subject, if shared by both sexes, would perhaps show that the difference is qualitative only. If this is so, the gain in developing it would be greater than that of merely doubling the number of social agents, for women will strike out according to their natural inclinations and cultivate fields that men would never have cultivated. They will thus add to the breadth, even if they do not add to the depth, of the world's progress."[1]

In order to establish this point more effectively, Ward takes up the field of literature, and after analyzing its possibilities, writes: "One great factor, however, has been omitted by nearly all who have discussed these questions. This factor is nothing less than exactly one-half of the human race, viz., womankind. Galton's point of view is of course exclusively androcentric. Woman is a wholly negligible factor in all his calculations. De Candolle devotes nearly two of the five hundred and seventy-six pages of his book to 'Women and Scientific Progress,' but no woman had ever been admitted to any of the great academies of which he treats. Jacoby's list may contain the names of some women. It would be profitless to search for them. M. Odin is the only one who has seen that the true cause of the small literary fecundity of women has

[1] "Applied Sociology," Lester F. Ward, Boston, Ginn & Co., 1906, p. 232.

been their almost complete lack of opportunity. He shows that where they have really enjoyed any opportunity they have done their share. Looking at the subject from the standpoint of the local environment alone, this is clearly brought out by the facts. The great superiority of Paris over all other cities in France has been sufficiently emphasized, even in the case of men. Paris produced 23.5 per cent. of the men of letters of France, but it produced 42.1 per cent. of the women of letters of France. This was because only there did woman find anything like a congenial environment. Only one other condition proved superior to Paris, and this was life in châteaux. The châteaux of France produced less than 2 per cent. of the men of letters, but they produced over 5 per cent. of the talented women."[1] "The production of women of letters coming from each class of localities corresponds exactly to the chances that the women had to acquire a higher education."[2]

M. Odin then analyzes histrionic talent, showing that women had furnished 29 per cent. of the persons eminent in that branch. In this one art, women have actually excelled men. In most lines, however, they fall far below the masculine standard,—a failure which is due to lack of opportunity rather than to lack of capacity. "Other things equal there is no reason to suppose *a priori* that woman is naturally inferior to man in any branch of literature."[3]

If Ward and Odin are at all correct in their conclu-

[1] *Ibid.* [2] *Ibid.*, p. 195. [3] *Idem.*

sion,—and no scientist has as yet seriously questioned it,—women's failure to achieve in the past is no more argument against her achievement in the future, than the failure of men to fly in the nineteenth century is an argument against their success in the twentieth century. Precedent can never effectually bind the future either of man or of woman.

The nineteenth century was barely aware of woman's capacity: the twentieth century is sure of it. The nineteenth century did not ever expect women to achieve, but the twentieth century is already pointing out the line of her progress.

Capacity for achievement, then, has finally been conceded to women. But achievement requires more than capacity. Opportunity is also essential. Therefore, since the achievement of the future depends in part upon the opportunities of today, it is pertinent to ask first what is the character of the environment surrounding the twentieth-century American woman; and second, what opportunities are afforded for converting her capacities into a form of achievement that will make for Social Progress.

CHAPTER V

THE INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION

AMONG other environmental conditions, a complete revolution in the home confronts the American Woman of today,—a revolution caused by the change, in the early nineteenth century, from the domestic to the factory system of making goods.

The home furnishes no exception to the rule that our so-called permanent institutions are continually changing in conformity with the new requirements arising out of the evolving conditions of life. Clothed with the hoary garments of tradition, the home stands as one of our oldest institutions, yet it has repeatedly changed its form. The early Teutonic home was a village or a collection of dwellings. The meaning of the word home has been narrowed, however, until it denotes the abode neither of a social group nor of a tribe, but that of an individual man and woman, their offspring and dependents. It was in such a home that the domestic system of production developed.

The domestic system, as its name implies, centered around the home, which was the producing unit, occupying in that respect the same position as the modern factory. Under the domestic system of in-

dustry the duties of the home were divided between its occupants.

In more primitive societies women carried on the industries almost exclusively, and consequently were responsible for most of the production in agriculture, in weaving, and in spinning as well as in the domestic arts. "An examination of the ethnological facts shows that among the primitive races men are engaged in activities requiring strength, violence, speed, and the craft and foresight which follow from the contacts and strains of their more motor life; and the slow, unspasmodic routine, stationary occupations are the part of woman."[1] Long before the development of domestic industry, which occurred during the fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, man began to share actively in the work of the home. Woman, the civilizing agent in society, had tamed her mate, teaching him to substitute productive occupations for war and idleness.

The same principle of the division of labor was carried into the domestic system of industry. The father, whether blacksmith, carpenter, or farmer, had his workshop within the home or close by in an adjoining building or field. The mother was a combination of cook, weaver, seamstress, cleaner, dairymaid, and general housewife. The boys served a long apprenticeship with their father in the shop or on the farm; the girls, in like manner, helped the mother in

[1] "Sex and Society," W. I. Thomas, Chicago, University of Chicago Press, 1907, p. 123.

her work, learning the rudiments of domestic industry almost as soon as they could walk or talk.

"The land was divided into small enclosures," writes Daniel Defoe, in 1724, "from two acres to six or seven each, seldom more, every three or four pieces of land having a house belonging to them; hardly a house standing out of speaking distance from another. We could see at every house a tenter and on almost every tenter a piece of cloth. Every clothier keeps one horse at least to carry his manufactures to the market; and every one generally keeps a cow or two or more for his family. By this means, the small pieces of enclosed land about each house are occupied, for they scarce sow corn enough to feed their poultry. The houses are full of lusty fellows, some at the dye vat, some at the looms; others dressing the clothes; the women and children carding and spinning, being all employed from the youngest to the oldest." Defoe concludes his description with a remark which is certainly not applicable to any manufacturing town of the present day: "Not a beggar to be seen, or an idle person."[1]

While the domestic system originated and reached its highest development in England, it was introduced into America by the British colonists who made the first important settlements here. Although modified somewhat to meet the new conditions, the domestic system persisted in forms which were distinctly Eng-

[1] "Industry in England," H. DeB. Gibbins, New York, Charles Scribner's Sons, 1907, pp. 326-7.

lish in their origin. Even today, in the mountains of Kentucky, whole communities of people may be found living and producing under conditions very similar to those of Elizabethan England.

Such was the home under the domestic system,—a complete economic unit; self-sustaining, impregnable, the pride and mainstay of Western civilization. Within fifty years, however, a series of inventions occurred which substituted steam for human strength, replaced hand labor by machinery and drew industry from the home into the factory. The establishment, between 1750 and 1800, of a new system of factory industry in place of the old system of domestic industry, is commonly referred to as the Industrial Revolution.

Previous to the Industrial Revolution, all labor was performed by human muscles. With the exception of a small employment of wind and of water power, men did the work of the world with their arms and legs. The last half of the eighteenth century, however, witnessed a phenomenal outpouring of inventive genius, which afforded a new basis for the conduct of industry. Watts, Hargreave, and Arkwright invented and perfected textile power machinery; Eli Whitney, by inventing the cotton gin, assured a large amount of raw material. Division of labor replaced craftsmanship; the home worker was face to face with the harnessed powers of nature, laboring at a rate and producing for a price which he could not duplicate. A weaver with the improved machinery was enabled to produce in a week sixteen hundred yards of shirt-

ing, while with the old hand loom, in the same length of time, he could produce only forty. A linen sheet that once required thirty days' labor was produced by the aid of a machine in seven hours.[1] In the days of hand spinning a single wheel kept a woman employed for one day in producing less yarn than is now taken in an hour from a spindle tended by one worker. The domestic worker was vanquished: he could not for an instant compete with these new powers; he must leave his hand loom and take up work in a factory, or face immediate starvation.

The division of labor resulting from the introduction of machinery gave rise to the most difficult problems which grew out of the Industrial Revolution. Under the domestic system one man had been a shoemaker, or a weaver, performing with his own hands all of the varied processes necessary to produce a complete product—a shoe, or a piece of cloth. A man spent years in learning to perfect his art, and gain speed and dexterity in his labor. But after the introduction of mechanical power and invention, a new alignment of trades became necessary.

Because of the required concentration upon some detail of a trade, a class of mechanical specialists was produced. The skilled shoemaker was no longer needed. Instead, the process of making a shoe was divided up into a large number of petty operations involving little or no skill. As an example, let me

[1] "Social Unrest," J. G. Brooks, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1906, pp. 178-181.

give you the list of the various classes of operatives employed in the stitching rooms of a shoe industry. "Skivers, cementers, pasters, folders (these all employed in the work of preparation), upper stitchers, eyelet row stitchers, closers, seam rubbers, seam pounders, gore stitchers, gusset stitchers, lining stitchers, lining makers, liners, closers on, inseamers, vamp liners, facing stitchers, beaders, top stitchers, corders, button-hole machine operators, button-hole finishers, button-sewers, punchers (of holes for eyelets), gang punch operators, eyeleters, fastener setters, hookers, markers (of vamp tips), tip markers, tip stitchers, tippers, tip pasters, perforators, tip fixers, vamp closers, vampers, barrers, stayers, heel-stay stitchers, eyelet stay stitchers, fancy stitchers, foxing stitchers, tongue binders, tongue stitchers, strap makers, table workers and table hands." "It should be emphasized that the work which has been subdivided into these forty-nine processes was formerly a single process done by one woman in the days before the invention of the sewing machine."[1]

Thus while many new skilled trades were developed, former skilled trades were largely eliminated, and the vast majority of the working population was reduced to semi-skilled or entirely unskilled operations.[2] Much

[1] "Woman in Industry," Edith Abbott, New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1910, pp. 181-2.

[2] For a discussion of the extent of some skilled and unskilled trades in American industry, see "Wages in the United States," Scott Nearing, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1911, Chapters IX and X.

unemployment and considerable individual hardship which resulted in the labor riots so aptly described in Dickens' "Barnaby Rudge," attended the change from domestic to factory industry.

The factory system inevitably replaced the domestic system of production because it insured cheapness and efficiency; first, by permitting the use of expensive and complicated labor-saving machinery which no individual workman could afford to purchase or maintain. Second, by the purchasing of materials in large quantities which factory production made possible. Lastly, by the utilization of by-products which occur in large-scale manufacturing. At every point the domestic system was out-classed, both in cheapness and in efficiency.

Through the Industrial Revolution, men changed the character of their own work. At the same time, they transformed the character of woman's work by invading the domestic sphere hitherto occupied by women. Food manufacture is, at the present time, largely a factory industry. Improved facilities for slaughter, packing and canning, together with the possibilities afforded by the locomotive and the refrigerator car of conveying the slaughtered products to a distance, have transformed the preparation of meat from a local into a world-wide industry. The canning of vegetables and fruit has also been affected by the improvement in mechanical processes and the possibility of transportation, and has been almost entirely taken from the women in the home by the men

and women in the factory. The preparation of breakfast foods has become, almost entirely, a factory industry, while the possibilities of economy in the baking of bread, crackers, cakes and pastry in large quantities have made it cheaper and easier for the average housewife to buy rather than to make her own breadstuffs. In the manufacture of cloths and clothing, machinery run by artificial power has proved so much cheaper and more efficient than hand labor that the making of clothes has come almost exclusively within the province of the factory. Hand weaving, spinning, knitting, tailoring, and dressmaking are, at the present time, wholly or largely performed within the factory. Division of labor, mechanical power and mechanical invention has rendered the maintenance of these industries in the home economically impossible. Thus since the advent of the factory system men have taken over at least two of the duties hitherto belonging exclusively to women, the preparation of food and the manufacture of clothing,—in other words, the constructive work of the woman in the home.

The home, a deserted workshop, deprived of its leading economic functions, was then left to face a transformation which we describe as the Domestic Revolution.

CHAPTER VI

THE DOMESTIC REVOLUTION

WHILE the industrial revolution was of profound significance to industry, its effect upon the home was no less fundamental. Under the domestic system of industry, the home was a complete economic unit, producing most of the goods which were required to satisfy the wants of the family. The industrial revolution, by substituting mechanical power and labor-saving machinery for the craftsmanship of the domestic system, affected the home in three ways.

1. It tended to perpetuate the home by facilitating the performance of the tasks remaining there and by changing their character.

2. It eliminated many industries from the home.

3. It revolutionized the economic and social outlook of the home.

The perpetuation of some home industries and the elimination of others was due largely to the invention of mechanical appliances. The present home industries have been bulwarked by a myriad of inventions, such as the stove, kitchen utensils, sweepers, washing machines, heating systems, soaps, sewing machines and the like. Cooking, cleaning and sewing are still, in part, performed in the home, but in every one of

these fields, inventions have materially lightened the housewife's labor.

Meanwhile the really constructive work has been largely eliminated from the home by the same forces that have perpetuated the less fundamental work there. The man of the house has been forced to follow his trade from the home workshop to the factory. With the continual development of the factory system, the improvement in invention, and the opening up of transportation facilities, night work and Sunday work have become common, and work at a distance from home often inevitable. Consequently the father and husband is compelled to absent himself from his family and home not only during work time, but often during his recreation time as well.

The more fundamental processes hitherto performed by women in the home such as spinning, weaving and the making of clothes, have been largely eliminated from the list of household duties. The women who were forced to help support themselves and their families could no longer produce sufficient goods within the limits of the four walls of home, and were compelled like the men to follow their work to the factory. This entrance of women into industry has increased yearly until in 1900 the number of women at work in gainful occupations in the United States had reached 5,319,912 or 14.3 per cent. of all the women in the country. In this aggregate are included not only single women, but married women, and little girls, some of them only ten years of age.

This transfer of the work of women from the home to the factory, begun by the industrial revolution, has since continued until now in the Twentieth Century, very little other than incidental work is left to the woman in the home. In nearly all communities, coöperation in the regulation and provision of a social supply of water, gas and electricity, and in a few communities, of a social system of house-heating has even removed from the home some of that incidental work.

Again with the development of coöperation in industry comes the development of coöperation in the training of children, and the consequent departure of even the child from the home during school hours. In the United States, school attendance is generally compulsory for all children under fourteen. Not only for his cultural training, but also for his technical training must the boy leave home. Even the girl who is forced to become self-supporting can no longer "earn her keep" and at the same time train herself for a housewife by doing odd chores at home. She also is forced to seek in the factory employment and livelihood.

Thus, by removing to a large extent the economic *raison d'être* of the home and by calling from it the majority of its inmates, the industrial revolution was responsible for a Domestic Revolution which practically eliminated the old type home of which we read so fondly in fiction and biography. It is in vain that F. Hopkinson Smith writes his eulogies of the old

home,—urging our return to it. The old home is gone irrevocably.

While the purely economic basis of the home has been transferred to the factory, the home continues to exist as an institution necessary to supply certain of the social and individual wants of its occupants. More efficient substitutes for the satisfaction of wants supplied by the home are daily becoming available, however, and the home is losing each year some of its economic and social functions.[1] With modern city life has come congestion and its many-sided problems, making all city homes, except those of the very rich, far from satisfactory as regards the space, air and sunlight provided within. The home is no longer the workshop, and requires therefore less room. Because of the greater distances which some men necessarily travel to their work, and because of the irregular hours of modern employment, even housekeeping and family life are at times impossible, and the lodging-house is looked to as the last resort. It is impossible not only to make a tenement room an economic unit, but even to provide it adequately with the most ordinary decencies of life. Indeed from the concentration of industry to the exhaustion of cheap fuel, all city conditions seem to have worked to the detriment of the home. To know the effect of the modern factory life upon standards, says John

[1] For a thorough discussion of the transformation of the home due to the Industrial Revolution, see "The Home." Charlotte Perkins Gilman, New York, McClure, Phillips & Co., 1903.

Andrew Fitch, you must see life in a steel worker's home. "A week of heavy toil, during ten or eleven hours of daylight, six or seven days, and then an overturning of things and a week of night work, each shift thirteen or fourteen hours long, and the 'mister' working while the children sleep, and sleeping while they play,—that is the regular round of events in the typical family while the weeks stretch to months, and the months mount to years. 'Home,' said many a steel worker to me with grim bitterness, 'is where I eat and sleep.'"[1]

But far more important than the comparative decrease of the means of satisfying individual wants within the home has been the increase of such means outside the home. Mechanical inventions, unsuited to a household, yet available in factories, hotels, apartments and restaurants; improved goods and services resulting from large scale production;—all these have contributed to make the outside agent,—the hotel, or restaurant,—far more capable of satisfying our material wants than the average home. For his hours of recreation the rich man has his club; the farmer, the corner grocery, and even the poor man has his saloon. The conclusion, therefore, seems obvious,—the home is no longer the best means of supplying our individual material wants.

Can this be truly said of the home as the best means of satisfying our social wants?

[1] "The Steel Industry and the Labor Problem," John A. Fitch, Charities and the Commons, March 6, 1909, p. 1091.

Solidarity in the home under the domestic system was produced by common industry and common responsibilities at home. Although aroused by a purely artificial means,—common work in the home,—a real group spirit inspired each family, a feeling of solidarity, which developed not only in the parents but in the growing child a sense of his responsibility to the group in which he was placed. But the old time industry has left home, taking with it the father to his shop or office, the children to the school, and often the mother to the factory. Only one really constructive occupation is left in the home, the bearing and rearing of children, and the incidence of this, when it exists, falls almost entirely upon the mother. Work, therefore, no longer unites the family. Consequently, in many families of the middle class, though every material want is abundantly satisfied, the lack of individual responsibility and of home solidarity eliminate from the family abode every real element of a home.

The material means of producing solidarity has left the home,—another means must therefore be substituted. Social ideals, not material things, must become the binding ties of a home in which solidarity will depend on an ethical rather than a material basis. A similarity of ideas, a conscious or unconscious tending of aims in the same direction, must take the place of coöperative home industry. For this new kind of home solidarity, four qualities are essential,—sympathy, compatibility, confidence and mutual aid. There must be sympathy between all the members of the

family; compatibility between the parents; confidence in their children, and mutual aid from all to all. With these four qualities as the foundation, home will become an atmosphere, a "condition in which" rather than a "place where." Thus, founded on ideas rather than upon industry, the home of the future, no longer a place but an atmosphere, will afford a new basis for solidarity and social growth almost limitless in its possibilities of development.

CHAPTER VII

THE NEW LEISURE FOR WOMEN

SAID the tramp, "If time were money, I'd be a millionaire." Many of us doubtless echo the thought; the tramp is not alone in his ecstatic contemplation of leisure. But in thinking of leisure time, few people have a really sound conception of its meaning. We should agree, universally, that it is a most desirable asset, yet to most of us the tramp's interpretation of leisure in terms of idleness would render it a rather questionable blessing.

The simplest interpretation of leisure, as I conceive it, is opportunity to choose a congenial avocation. Obviously this avocation would vary with individuals as much as tastes in color, decoration and architecture. Usually it would be some pursuit differing radically from the daily routine. For those engaged in sedentary occupations, leisure should mean physical exercise. I know of one business man who revels in an axe and a chopping-block. For the man who gains his bread by the actual sweat of his brow, some occupation that gives complete muscular relaxation is the logical employment for his leisure hour.

No rules can be fixed for leisure, however, because leisure must represent free choice, and the choice of

one man may not appeal to another. A foreigner when attending a ball in a large American city inquired why people who could afford to dress so well could not afford to hire others to dance for them. He could not conceive of people voluntarily employing their leisure in dancing.

It has come to be a well recognized psychological fact that what we do from choice is more faithfully and more perfectly done, than that which we do from necessity. A series of experiments in our public schools shows that the child who studies a subject because of his interest in it progresses far more rapidly than the child who studies it under compulsion. Nothing can stimulate the faculties to greater activity than keen personal interest.

In view of these facts, it is no wonder that the greatest things of the world have been done in leisure time. The great poets, the great philosophers, the great artists were men who had sufficient means to support them while pursuing their avocations, or who, like Coleridge and Rousseau, absolutely neglected the material welfare of those dependent upon them, and blissfully pursued their chosen vocations. Rousseau sent his own children to a hospital for foundlings, and used his leisure time to work out a theory for the proper education of the young. Again, the great scientists and the great statesmen of the world have usually been men who have had leisure in which to work out and perfect their thought. In other words, leisure for the normal, healthy individual with a fund

of surplus energy means not idleness, but opportunity to pursue a congenial occupation.

What has this to do with women? The industrial revolution, the overturning of the old home, the use of leisure time,—are not these subjects woefully aside from the point of our story? By no means. The industrial revolution, by taking woman's occupations out of the home, has given her leisure.

Women in past ages rarely enjoyed leisure. In primitive society, they performed practically all of the work. An Australian of the Kurnai tribe once said: "A man hunts, spears fish, fights, and sits about," and this is a very good general statement of the male activities of primitive society the world over, if we add one other activity—the manufacture of weapons. On the other hand, Bonwick's statement of the labors of Tasmanian women is a typical one: "In addition to the necessary duty of looking after the children, they had to provide all the food for the household excepting that derived from the chase of the kangaroo. They climbed up hills for the opossum, delved in the ground with their sticks for yams, native bread, and nutritive roots, groped about the rocks for shellfish, dived beneath the sea for oysters, and fished for the finny tribe. In addition to this, they carried, on their frequent tramps, the household stuff in native baskets of their own manufacture. Their affectionate partners would even pile upon their burdens sundry spears and waddies not required for present service, and would command their help to rear

the breakwind, and to raise the fire. They acted, moreover, as cooks to the establishment, and were occasionally regaled, at the termination of a feast, with the leavings of their gorged masters."[1]

Under the domestic system the care of children, the cooking, spinning, weaving, clearing, making of clothes, all fell to the lot of the woman, until the proverb reads:

> "Man works from rise to set of sun
> But woman's work is never done,"

a tribute to the heterogeneous character of the odd jobs which women performed.

When, however, after the industrial revolution, the factory began gradually to take away from women all those tasks which could be systematized and performed advantageously by large-scale coöperation, the situation was radically changed. With the advance of coöperative industry and the continually lessening number of tasks in the home, women have been enabled for almost the first time since the beginning of modern civilization to enjoy a limited amount of leisure. Not only has the change in the character of industry effected this result: the development and improvements of the modern public school system, the introduction of kindergartens, playgrounds and school gardens have considerably relieved the overworked mother of the wage-earner's family, as well as the wife of the comfortably fixed clerk, or small-salaried man.

[1] "Sex and Society," W. I. Thomas, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1907, pp. 124-5.

Another factor of the utmost importance in affording leisure to women is the decrease in the number of persons per family and the decreasing birth rate prevalent throughout the United States, particularly among the native-born population. The census figures show that the average number of persons per family in the United States is steadily decreasing. In Boston, Chicago and Philadelphia the decrease has been regular at each decade since 1880.[1]

Not only is the family smaller in size,—but the American birth rate has decreased until, at the present time among college graduates, it is less than two children per family, while for the American-born population at large, the number of children per family is only slightly more than two.[2] Benjamin Franklin estimated that in his day the average family numbered eight children. The decrease is astounding. Since the bearing and rearing of children is a heavy drain on a woman's time and energy, the decreasing birth rate has resulted in the release of a considerable amount of the energy formerly spent in child-bearing and child-rearing. The mother of today, therefore, has not only more leisure time than the woman of fifty or a hundred years ago, but more energy to pursue some avocation during her leisure time.

This new leisure, already assured to the women of the upper and middle classes and in many cases becom-

[1] Census 1900, Vol. II. Population.

[2] See "Modern Social Conditions," W. B. Bailey, New York, Century Co., 1906, Chapter III. "Social Adjustment," Scott Nearing, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1911, Chapter VII.

ing possible to the working woman, particularly where an eight-hour day is observed, presents to women a fundamental choice between two alternatives. The first one is to follow the line of least resistance and gradually to drift into a condition of sex parasitism. The dictionary defines a parasite as "an obsequious flatterer living lazily at another's expense." Parasitism as applied to women is that condition in which the woman ceases to produce in proportion to the amount which she consumes, relying largely upon her sex qualities as the motive inducing the male to provide for her support. The artificiality of this position is obvious. Talents were not given to men to be hidden under a bushel or buried in a napkin, but to be employed in such a manner that they might develop rather than degenerate. The woman who consumes her time in dressing, in adorning herself, in idle chatter and dissipation, gradually loses whatever constructive talents may have been hers. Since the unused talent finally disappears, voluntary sex parasitism results ultimately in compulsory sex parasitism.

There is one commonly suggested remedy for this situation. "The place of women is in the home," we hear, "let women remain there and do the work which they have always done." Some may go still further and say, "If men alone can produce sufficient to support all, let the women be kept as passive tools and be subsidized if necessary." A few years ago a man of note in England actually proposed that a "compulsory provision be made for at least the women of the upper

and middle classes, by which they might be maintained through life entirely without regard to any productive labor they might perform."[1]

Society cannot progress like the crab. The new leisure for women presents but one other alternative to parasitism. The true sphere of women, like the true sphere of man, is the place where really constructive work is to be done, whether it be the home or the workshop. Nearly a century ago man's constructive work left the home; for women it is now moving, and the vans are heavily laden. Leisure is an opportunity to choose a congenial avocation. If women use their leisure to develop what gifts they may possess, to do the work which opportunity offers, then will the blandishments of the parasite sink to their real value, and righteousness prove its own reward through the blessedness of constructive effort.

[1] "Woman and Labor," Olive Schreiner, New York, F. A. Stokes Co., 1911, p. 116.

CHAPTER VIII

SOCIAL TRADITIONS

"Custom calls me to 't
What custom wills in all things should we do it."
—*Shakespeare.*

CUSTOM calls at every hand. Shall we obey its behests? Only when in so doing we may contribute our part to that social progress for which each generation is responsible.

Custom, tradition, and precedent have taken a heavy toll in the past. India lies today abject under their despotic sway. We laugh contemptuously at the Chinese who reject the American chilled-steel plow, and continue to use an inefficient implement because it was used by their ancestors. We describe the United States as "the land of the free and the home of the brave," where "all men are created free and equal." But despite our scoffings at precedent, even in the United States there are a number of traditions,—social, legal, political and moral,—whose force dominates thought and action.

Our laws foster the respect for tradition. The decisions of our courts are based time and time again upon the English precedents which were established under conditions materially different from those exist-

ing in the United States. Nevertheless, we accept their authority.

Obedience to tradition signifies inherent weakness,—inability or unwillingness to make decisions based upon the merits of the case, and a preference to rely upon the decision of some great man who lived under the conditions of a past generation. Hence it is the weakest, not only physically, but socially and economically, who are most bound by the fear of the past. The strong make precedent; the weak fear it.

It is in savage tribes where superstition is dominant that men and women are most bound by tradition. In our society the yoke falls most heavily upon those who bear already many burdens, our so-called weaker sex. Originally because of their physical inferiority, now primarily because of the dependence growing out of that inferiority, women are peculiarly bound by the traditions and the customs of the past.

The tradition of woman's naturally dependent nature is wide-spread. As an outcome of the age of chivalry where woman was pictured as an ideal rather than as a reality, men have come to regard her as superior morally and spiritually and hence unfit to grapple with the important problems of life. They fear contamination, they say, for her pure and lofty character. Hence, in their eagerness to preserve her idealistic nature, men have bound her in on every side by traditions, preventing her from self-government, personal decisions and real growth in social feeling.

Woman's intuitive power is entirely misunderstood.

Instead of regarding it as an additional attribute of women, perhaps as a compensation for physical weakness, men have come to consider it a substitute for the power of reasoning. A professor recently addressed a co-educational college class as follows: "Women are emotional. They reach their decisions by means of intuition,—a roundabout way, which no man could follow. Men are rational. Logic governs their thought. In forming their decisions, they proceed by logical steps from premise to conclusion." "But Professor," began one of these unreasoning females, "are you sure . . . ?" "It doesn't make any difference what you say, Miss Jane," interrupted this open-minded representative of the reasoning sex, "I won't change my mind." The word intuition to such minds as his is closely allied to the word instinct as applied to the animal world. As a matter of fact, women reason by "hops" no oftener than men reason from prejudice. The few women who have been given the opportunity for mind development can trace their thoughts step by step, and when sufficient data is available, can reach a perfectly logical conclusion.

Again, the complementary tradition concerning woman's superior moral goodness may be paralleled with a disparaging one in respect to her moral bias. Women, we are told, are traditionally partial—their judgment in matters of importance is governed by their personal prejudices and sympathies.

Woman's traditional narrowness, however, is in reality not the cause but the result of the dependent

position into which tradition forces her. It is almost impossible for a woman with undeveloped physical and mental powers, confined to the narrow circle of one "social set"—to rise above the banalities of every-day life. Her mind demands activity, yet its range of possibilities is confined to the trivial concerns of the household, the servant problem, the question of dress and fashion, and endless gossip about the neighbors.

The tradition of woman's dependent nature leads her further into economic dependence. Practically all women nowadays are dependent for support either upon an individual man, be he father, brother, or husband, who provides for her physical necessities, or upon society as an aggregate of men offering her employment at their terms, in return for which she receives in most cases bare subsistence wages. That this economic dependence is not inherent in the nature of things but largely the result of man-made tradition may be proved by analogies from the few societies where women have the ascendancy. During the recent British expedition into Thibet, in negotiating for the repair of a road, the contract was made through the matriarch who not only named the price and received the pay, but sent several of her husbands to do the work.[1] Again, all the family's sewing in East Central Africa is done by the men. According to MacDonald in the *Journal of the Anthropological Institute* of August, 1892, the men are the better tailors. In fact

[1] "Sex Equality," E. Densmore, New York, Funk & Wagnalls Co., 1907, p. 109.

the tradition that men shall do the sewing is so strong that a wife "can obtain a divorce if she can show a rent in her petticoat." Among the Senecas (1873) the female portion usually ruled the house. The husband who proved unsatisfactory might at any time be ordered to pick up his blanket and depart. He could only be saved then by the intercession of some aunt or grandmother. Otherwise he must retreat to his own clan or form a new matrimonial alliance in some other clan.[1]

But woman's traditional dependence is not only economic, it is social as well. Since women are denied contact with their peers in industry, and find it only in the social set to which they belong, they are peculiarly subject to the rules of the social game. In society, fashion reigns supreme. Its dictates are so absolute that few women dare risk the inevitable criticism and possible social ostracism resulting from disobedience to its decrees. The socially ambitious must be slaves to a fashion, whose rules apply not only to the clothes of women, but to their homes, their methods of living and standards of life.

Fashion in clothes proves a hard master,—for it is in reality a masculine creation. Frequent changes in style bring rich returns to the manufacturer of clothing, hence the men who decide the fashions have decided that a new outfit is required at least once a year if a woman does not wish to be conspicuously

[1] "Ancient Society," L. H. Morgan, New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1907, p. 455.

ill-dressed. Moreover, the individual appropriateness of any particular style of dress must be quite disregarded. The hideous and ludicrous creations so common of late years, such as the "Merry Widow" and "peach basket" hats, and "hobble and harem" skirts, richly deserve the opprobrium heaped upon them. The unfortunate women who are compelled by the force of tradition to disfigure themselves therein are more to be pitied than scorned. The wife of a lieutenant, showing her hand-embroidered underwear to an admiring young friend, explained, "You see I've got my husband, now I must keep him." This good lady considered underwear as much her stock in trade as drugs are to the druggist.

In obedience to the tradition of fashion in personal appearance, women in China for centuries bound their feet until their toes dropped off. The Chinese missionaries, telling such tales before an American audience, bring floods of tears to the eyes of the tender-hearted women present, who sit with their bodies constricted in corsets so tight that their natural respiration is seriously interfered with, and the welfare, not of their feet, but of the vital organs encased in the trunk, is menaced. Dr. Sargent of Harvard University has made some interesting experiments concerning the effect of corsets. "In order to ascertain the influence of tight clothing upon the action of the heart during exercise a dozen young women consented this summer to run 540 yards in their loose gymnasium garments and then to run the same dis-

tance with corsets on. The running time was two minutes and thirty seconds for each person at each trial, and in order that there should be no cardiac excitement or depression following the first test, the second trial was made the following day. Before beginning the running the average heart-impulse was 84 beats to the minute; after running the above-named distance the heart-impulse was 152 beats to the minute; the average natural waist-girth being 25 inches. The next day corsets were worn during the exercise, and the average girth of waist was reduced to 24 inches. The same distance was run in the same time by all, and immediately afterward the average heart-impulse was found to be 168 beats per minute. When I state that I should feel myself justified in advising an athlete not to enter a running or rowing race whose heart-impulse was 160 beats per minute after a little exercise, even though there were not the slightest evidence of disease, one can form some idea of the wear and tear on this important organ, and the physical loss entailed upon the system in women who force it to labor for half their lives under such a disadvantage as the tight corset imposes."[1]

Fashion also dictates the kind of home in which families shall live. In certain social sets three stories are necessary to keep up appearances even if the third be as bare as a barn. Window curtains at all windows visible from the street, a piano, and cut glass in the

[1] "Physical Development of Women," D. A. Sargent, *Scribner's Magazine*, Vol. V, p. 181 (1889).

dining room are social requisites. In some cities residence north or south of a certain street permits or prevents intercourse with the socially élite. And the women who cannot afford all the fashionable luxuries will often deny themselves the real necessities of life in order to put lace curtains at their windows or purchase cheap bric-à-brac for the parlor mantel.

Accompanying an increase in income usually comes the desire to rise in the social scale, to spend the extra funds for what is socially desirable rather than for what the individual family needs. A new chair is preferred to a gas stove, and an automobile to a really competent mother's helper for the children.

Women are further restricted by religious traditions. Under the religion of China, the oldest, probably, of civilized people, woman was traditionally the absolute property of her husband. She was believed to possess neither mind nor soul. The Hindoo and Parsee scriptures command women to regard men as divine, and to render them absolute submission and worshipful reverence.

Under the Jewish religion as represented by the Old Testament, woman's position was slightly higher. Man was bid to leave father and mother and to cleave to the woman whom he should choose. Rebecca's consent was sought in her marriage; Jacob toiled fourteen years for Rachel. "Deborah, the wife of Lapidoth a prophetess, acted as a judge and leader over Israel. Maacha, the wife of Rehoboam, conducted the government of the state, during the child-

hood of her grandson, Asa." "Salome Alexandra, the consort of King Alexander Jannaeus, reigned nine years over the Kingdom of Judaea after her husband's premature death."[1] The thirty-first chapter of Proverbs gives a beautiful picture of the ideal wife and mother, yet in the Ten Commandments a woman is classed along with the servants and domestic animals. The Talmudic writers, again, value their women highly. While the Bible tolerated polygamy, under the Talmud, monogamy was generally practised. "God," says one of the writers in the "Talmud" "has endowed woman with greater wisdom and finer sensibilities, because she has nobler work to do than man."

It is not until we come to the writings of St. Paul that the religious traditions of Jewry turn drastically against women. According to his teaching and the theology founded upon it, woman is the unclean one, the seducer. Marriage seemed almost as much of an evil as prostitution appears to many today. Celibacy was idealized, and marriage was made a sacrament of the Church in an attempt to purify it. Tertullian says, "Celibacy must be chosen, though the human race perish in consequence." Augustine: "Celibates will shine in heaven, like dazzling stars, while the parents who begot them resemble stars without light." Peter tells women to be "obedient unto your husbands." St. Paul says, "It is good for a man not to touch a woman."[2] . . . "The head of every man is

[1] "Woman's Position in Ancient and Modern Jewry," Joseph Straus, *Westminster Review*, Dec., 1910, p. 626.

[2] I Corinthians VII, 1.

Christ; and the head of the woman is the man."[1] . . . "The man is not of the woman, but the woman for the man."[2] . . . "Let your women keep silence in the churches; for it is not permitted unto them to speak; but they are commanded to be under obedience."[3] "Let the woman learn in silence with all subjection. But I suffer not a woman to teach, nor to usurp authority over the man, but to be in silence. For Adam was first formed, then Eve."[4]

Mohammedan traditions further degrade woman. Mohammed himself practised, and advocated plural marriages. Pre-marital companionship between men and women seemed dangerous to the man, hence he commanded women to wear a veil when appearing in public. Pierre Loti in "Les Désenchantées" gives us a pitiful picture of the Mohammedan women of today who have become enlightened and are endeavoring to break their bond of subserviency.

A number of religious traditions still remain from early Christianity. Women avoid appearing in church with uncovered heads, and few churches will allow a woman to speak or preach from the pulpit. Strangely enough there has developed a tradition that women are more religious than men, as evinced by their greater conscientiousness and more regular church attendance. This attitude, however, is rather pure emotionalism than religious fervor, and is adopted by many women as a substitute for a really constructive occupation

[1] I Corinthians XI, 3.
[2] I Corinthians XI, 9.
[3] I Corinthians XIV, 34.
[4] I Timothy II, 11-13.

which circumstances have denied them. Her so-called morality is in fact only a susceptibility to religious influence, and is far more the result of her enforced habit of submission to a higher power, than of her possession of any essentially higher moral tone.

More practical in their actual effects are the legal traditions which attach themselves to women. Some extracts from Blackstone's Commentaries[1] will serve to show the precedents for the tradition of woman's legal inferiority. "By marriage, the husband and wife are one person in the law, that is, the very being or legal existence of the woman is suspended during the marriage, or at least is incorporated or consolidated into that of the husband, under whose wing, protection and cover she performs everything. . . . Her condition during her marriage is called her coverture." Again, if a wife be injured in her person or her property, she can bring no action for redress without her husband's concurrence." "There are some instances in which she is separately considered, as inferior to him and acting by his compulsion." "The husband also, by the old law, might give his wife moderate correction." In regard to divorce Blackstone says, "The civil law allows absolute divorce if the wife goes to the theatre or public games without the knowledge or consent of the husband." Again in regard to guardianship of children, "The legal power of the father, for the mother, as such, is entitled to no power, is, etc." It is not remarkable, with such precedents as

[1] Book 1, Chapter XV, Sections II and III.

these, that women have until very recently been traditionally incapacitated by law.

Perhaps the most curious tradition by which women are bound,—curious, because it is the most insistent,—is that concerning women's occupation and sphere. How often do we hear the self-satisfied man declare that the place of woman is in the home. Women have, from time immemorial, been forced to occupy themselves exclusively as housekeeper, wife and mother. If the individual is so unfortunate as to be unable to become a mother, she must content herself as the housekeeper, for the term wife itself implies no stated occupation. "It would be much," says Harrison in his "Realities and Ideals," "if our generation could establish this: that the place of the wife and the mother is in her home." Schopenhauer says of woman, "She is not called to great things. . . . She pays her debt to life by the throes of birth, care of the children, subjection to her husband. . . . Girls should be brought up to habits of domesticity and servility." It is woman's vocation to nurse and educate children, because she is herself childish and remains an overgrown child all her life, a kind of intermediate thing between the child and the man, who is the only proper human being. It is the Nietzschean theory that motherhood is the secret justification of woman's existence. An old English book, "The English Housewife," published in London by Nicholas Okes in 1607, gives the "Inward and outward virtues which ought to be in a complete woman,—her skill in physicke,

surgery, cookery, extraction of oils, banqueting stuffs, ordering of feasts, preserving of all sorts of wines, conceited secrets, distillations of perfumes, ordering of wool, hemp, flax, making cloth and dyeing, etc., etc., and of all other things belonging to a household." In short, all women, no matter what their desires or capacities, should, according to our traditions, fit themselves to the only occupations allowed them and should endeavor as nearly as possible to reconcile their angles and deviations from type to the regulation pattern of wifehood.

The bond of tradition may not be so strong in the United States as it is in China or India, but it requires a courageous woman to dare disobey the social precedents laid down before her. Upon the head of those who dare defy a defunct, senseless precedent, society has heaped not the praise due to a successful pioneer, but the sneers and opprobrium which are erstwhile the lot of a social outcast.

CHAPTER IX

MASCULINE DOMINANCE

"THE sacrifice of wives in Africa, India, Fiji, Madagascar, and elsewhere, upon the death of husbands, shows how completely the person of the female had been made a part of the male activity. Where this practice obtained, the failure of the widow to acquiesce in the habit was highly immoral. Williams says of the strangling of widows by the Fijians: 'It has been said that most women thus destroyed are sacrificed at their own instance. There is truth in this statement, but unless other facts are taken into account, it produces an untruthful impression. Many are importunate to be killed, because they know that life would henceforth be to them prolonged insult, neglect and want. . . . If the friends of the woman are not the most clamorous for her death, their indifference is construed into disrespect either for her late husband or his friends.' "[1] In this age of conflict so aptly characterized by Thomas, when physical strength was the prevailing force, "survival of the fittest" was not a mere catch phrase; the incomprehensible and unmanageable forces of nature, savage and hostile tribes,

[1] "Sex and Society," W. I. Thomas, University of Chicago Press, 1907, p. 169.

and the wild beasts of the jungle were ever eliminating those creatures who lacked alertness and physical fitness.

In this continual struggle against enemies, man, as the possessor of the characteristics most continually in requisition, easily obtained dominance over his partner, woman. While her average strength may be equal to man's, her sex functions cause it to fluctuate continually, rendering her at times entirely helpless, so that she falls an easy prey to man's despotism. Moreover because of the exigencies demanding physical strength, there was inbred in women themselves a respect for physique so great as to induce them to select as mates the strongest and ablest men. Thus strong men were reproduced and fostered, and masculine dominance was the inevitable result.

Another contributory force existed in the child marriage of primitive societies. Girls were betrothed at birth, and married at the age of a few weeks, months or years, often to an adult. As a result they began to bear when least able to resist it, the yoke of the dependent. Moreover, in the regimen of life necessary where depredation is the means of survival, the ablebodied man inevitably develops an attitude of mastery toward all those weaker than himself, especially toward those immediately dependent upon him, and he comes to regard this relation as right and highly desirable.

In such a primitive society where physical strength is needed for survival, a division of occupation becomes

inevitable. The man fights and hunts and the woman does the homekeeping and perpetuates the race. Havelock Ellis, in his examination of the French epic cycle discovers a society in which men fought and women had the utmost contempt for the coward in war. Woman possessed the freedom of initiative in love, but after she became a wife, was entirely under the dominion of her husband and often regarded by him with the greatest contempt.[1]

Masculine dominance was so vigorous an offspring of the age of conflict that it still persists in spite of the obviously complete change in the test of social survival. It is no longer the biggest or strongest, he who can use his hands and arms most effectively, who survives. Man has thrown off the dominance of brute strength, and mental, not physical power is the test of survival today. The accumulated civilization of the ages has advanced far beyond the dreams of our remotest ancestors, but like a child with an outgrown toy, we still cling to the sex dominance of the days of primitive culture.

Not only is masculine dominance physical—it has likewise become moral and social and political. In his moral ascendancy, man has been most clever in his method of maintaining his control. He first insists that woman is innately better than man, but requires of her only the virtues which he does not desire for himself, and limits her to the immoralities of which he

[1] "Man and Woman," Havelock Ellis, London, W. Scott, Ltd., 1897, pp. 12-13.

does not greatly disapprove. By man's continual insistence upon honor as the great virtue of woman, he has led her to place an artificial value upon it, and to sacrifice all other virtues to this one, a virtue which strangely enough may be possessed only in a negative sense. Cicely Hamilton's adage of the thief is an apt one. Woman may keep her honor only so long as chance is kind enough not to throw in her way a man so brutal as to deprive her of it. But when once deprived of it she may not cry out her theft upon the housetops and demand the pursuit of the thief. Her lack of strength to resist the theft is deemed a disgrace, to be hidden if possible and greeted with contempt when revealed. The thief, on the other hand, rejoicing in his superior strength is rather admired by the world, and pursues his way, untouched. In France, a law still survives from the Napoleonic code forbidding *"qu'on cherche le père."* One could hardly conceive a more desirable code of ethics from the man's point of view.

Even in marriage a double standard of morality still prevails for the sexes. Framed by men alone, the laws indicate most clearly their intention to subjugate the female by restricting her sexual freedom while leaving that of the male practically unlimited.

But while the honor of the individual woman is required to be unquestionable, and that of men is almost unquestioned, the violation of the honor of a group of women whose number is legion, is not only sanctioned but rendered a perpetual institution in this

society which men have evolved. In order to justify the existence of prostitution, men have at various times invented the one-time plausible excuse of "physical necessity" and have even been upheld by prominent medical men in their insistence upon this opportunist plea. They have, moreover, so applied the doctrine of innate immorality to their unfortunate victims, as to prevent, until very recently, any pity among the more protected women for their fallen sisters.

Prostitution has existed since masculine dominance prevailed. In Greek and Roman civilization it was an unquestioned institution. "In Athens a sumptuous temple was dedicated to the Goddess Hetaera. In the time of Plato 400 years B. C., there were no less than one thousand prostitutes in the temple of Aphrodite in Corinth."[1] . . . Demosthenes thus defines the sexual relations: "We marry in order to obtain legitimate children and a faithful warder of the house; we keep concubines as servants for our daily attendance, but we seek the Hetaera for love's delight." In the middle ages prostitution existed as a regulated trade, having a distinct guild organization. There were brothels in all towns of any size, belonging usually to the municipality, sometimes even to the church into whose treasuries their proceeds flowed. "The women in these brothels elected their own 'head-mistress,' whose duty it was to preserve order and discipline and who jealously sought to prevent competitors that

[1] "Woman," A. Bebel, London, Wm. Reeves, Tr. by B. A. Walther, 3rd Edition, pp. 19-20.

did not belong to the guild from spoiling the trade."[1]

Not a particle less hideously does prostitution exist today sometimes licensed, as in Paris and New Orleans, but oftener flowing on as a dark undercurrent, not to be mentioned openly, unsuspected by many of the innocent ones who are drawn into its vortex, but ever gaining strength and impetus with its flow. The unfortunates are absolutely without hope of escape. Reginald Wright Kauffman, in his "House of Bondage" shows how hideous and how insidious is the system and how small any chance of rescue. The extent of the so-called white slave traffic in America is only beginning to be suspected by its investigators.[2] Statistics are unobtainable because of the very nature of the trade. But there it exists,—a hideous system of vice, a monument to the insistence of men upon a double standard of morality for the sexes.

"It may be true," pleads the man, "that we are responsible for a system which degrades some women, but you must at least admit that our treatment of a great majority of women is such as to idealize rather than to degrade them." Paradoxical as it may appear, this very sentiment furnishes the basis for the whole social system of woman's dependence. A few women may be degraded morally by a masculine standard of morality, but the vast majority are socially degraded by the dependence resulting from man's intended idealism.

[1] *Supra*, p. 32.

[2] "The White Slave Traffic," O. E. Janney, National Vigilance Committee, New York, 1911.

This idealism centers primarily around the home, the most idealized of all Anglo-Saxon institutions. From the era of the domestic system, when the activities of both men and women were centered about the home, has come the tradition that the place of women is the home. Bandied about from mouth to mouth, this phrase has finally been accepted as the expression of divine intent. Whether a woman have the soul of a poet, the inventive power of a genius or the executive capacity and foresight of a statesman, she is relegated to the sphere of the pantry and the washtub, and made to assume all the characteristics which men have so generously designated as "feminine."

Professing to have the highest respect for the so-called "superior" sex, men have never ceased, since they first began taking over industry from the home to the factory, to thus limit the sphere of women. Carefully selecting all the qualities which they deemed undesirable for themselves,—purity, constancy, devotion, reserve, self-sacrifice, sweetness, gentleness, jealousy, cowardice,—men have abandoned them to the so-called weaker sex. "Woman once the superior, now the equal of man" is a common phrase in the mouths of those who thus try to suppress the efforts of a few women to assume the qualities which men desire to reserve for themselves.

Thucydides expresses his opinion of women thus: "The wife who deserves the highest praise is she of whom one hears neither good nor evil outside her house."

The poet Schiller in his turn generously venerates her:

"Her might is gentleness, she winneth sway
By a soft word and a sober look.
Strength, power, majesty belong to men
They make the glory native to his life
But sweetness is a woman's attribute."

Otto Weininger in his "Woman and Mankind" (p. 334) thus philosophizes upon the desires of women: "But the question is, How ought man to treat woman? As she herself desires to be treated or as the moral idea would dictate?" (Note here the antithesis between the womanly idea and the moral idea.) "If he is going to treat her as she wishes, he must beat her, for she likes to be hurt; he must hypnotize her, since she likes to be hypnotized; he must prove to her by his attentions how little he thinks of himself for she likes compliments and has no desire to be respected for herself." How vast must have been his experience, how great his confidence in his own judgment, to justify these conclusions. Andrew Mac Phail in his "Essays in Fallacy" recommends the "effeminate woman, who overcomes man by the force of continual quietness. She may understand all knowledge and have strength to remove all public grievance; yet she is nothing if she has not entered into the mystery of gentleness."

And what has been the effect of this masculine attitude upon the character of women? "Seek and ye shall find," says the Scripture. Men have finally succeeded in finding in woman what they have so long endeavored to develop there; but with the enforced

characteristics have come others not so desirable, but which follow as inevitably as day follows night. Deceit and cunning are always co-existent with tyranny and despotism; with lack of opportunity for physical development has come weakness and cowardice; with oppression and dependence have come degradation and servility; with the necessity for assuming the qualities which men desire in her has come the habitude of continual masquerade; with lack of opportunity to judge and decide, and with careful seclusion from the great problems of the world, have come lack of judgment and initiative power, and a false estimate of the value of her own petty problems. One of the characteristics of woman against which men most endlessly rail is her tendency to personalize. He delights in quoting the woman who replied, in answer to the statement that women personalize everything: "I don't." "A girl," to quote Stevenson's "Virginibus Puerisque," "has always lived in a glass house among approving relatives, whose word was law; she has been bred up to sacrifice her judgments, to take the key submissively from dear papa; and it is wonderful how swiftly she can change her tune into the husband's."

Finally man deplores, criticizes and even condemns the results of his dominance of woman. True the result of man's dominance is an inferior creature, but she still retains at least one virtue, the power of perception, and she is just beginning to perceive that the dominance of one sex by the other is a hideous anachronism. With knowledge comes power.

CHAPTER X

MARRIAGE AS A TRADE

"MAN desires a being that not only loves but understands him, a being whose heart not only beats for him, but whose hand smooths his brow, a being that, wherever it appears, irradiates peace, rest, order, silent control over itself and over the thousand trifles that make up his daily life; he desires a being that diffuses over everything that indefinable odor of womanhood, which is the vivifying warmth of domestic life."[1]

Thus do men picture to themselves and to the world their ideal of a wife, and feel that they have transfigured far above the sordid realities of life the woman who is to exert for them this silent, soothing influence. Alas! after all is said and we come down to hard facts, this grand eloquent idealization of woman means, being interpreted, little more than "second fiddle."

Men have insisted upon stressing the religious and social side of marriage, rather than its practical aspects. A sacred right having its origin in the Old Testament, —where, we add parenthetically, plural wives were not at all uncommon, and the rights of the individual wife quite generally disregarded,—sanctioned by the

[1] "Woman," A. Bebel, London, William Reeves (no date), p. 51. Quoted from "Woman from the Standpoint of Political Economy," Lorenze von Stein.

rites and ceremonies of the church, conferring upon woman all the dignity that the fulfillment of her divine function can confer—thus has marriage been again and again defined. Woman's chief social function, to be sure, is to perpetuate her race; but though social in its object, this perpetuation is purely physical, a faculty that belongs alike to the birds of the air and to the beasts of the jungle. Since the relation between race perpetuation and marriage is an artificial one, woman not infrequently fails to perpetuate in spite of the institution of marriage. In fact the two are not so interdependent as we fondly imagine. They may occur and do occur absolutely irrespective of each other.

In discussing marriage and propagation, we invariably fail to take into consideration the next generation. A child has not a divine right to be born unless it can properly be provided for. Unlimited propagation is a crime against the child as well as against society, and should be as deeply condemned as wife- or child-desertion.

There is, however, another aspect of marriage, far too often disregarded, which is neither so idealistic nor so beautiful as the social and religious aspect. I speak of the aspect of Marriage as a Trade.

To how many men, I wonder, has it ever occurred that for the vast majority of women marriage was until very recently the only means of support in which they could retain the respect of the world? The "old maid" has been the laughing-stock of generations, the

first and last resource of the comic magazines, the joke-makers and punsters. Men, from time immemorial have been allowed to choose their trade or occupation. Even the members of the proletariat may at least choose the method by which they shall be exploited,—the manner in which they shall labor for their subsistence. But women, excluded from the field of industry, often barred by custom and law from even possessing property, have had but one choice. If the individual woman could succeed in so arousing and fulfilling the desires of the male as to induce him to share his property and earnings with her, she might by a simple process of exchange, yield up her person for the means of existence. Any variation from this rule in past generations met not only with the disapprobation of the world but even with persecution and punishment. Witch-burning, commonly thought of as a relic of barbarism, was in the last analysis merely the penalty paid by women who deviated from the type of colorless wife and mother of which men approved at that time. It was not only the hag, the decrepit and the infirm who fell victims to this barbarity, it was the woman who evinced any kind of peculiarity, whether unusual beauty, mental power or the genius of Joan d'Arc.

Is it strange, then, that women are eager to marry—that, after all other trades have been forbidden them, they cling to marriage as a first and last resort,—their only hope of social salvation? Is it surprising that they learn to point the finger of scorn at the unmarried women? Far be it from anyone to cast reflection upon

the bachelor! Moreover since the census figures tell us that females are in the majority in practically all civilized countries, and since a more or less fixed per cent. of the men everywhere elect to remain in single blessedness, the mathematical result is obvious,—a large number of women, no matter what their efforts or charms, must inevitably fail to enter the married state.

As a further handicap to the pursuit of her trade,—marriage,—custom has ordained that the woman appear reluctant to follow her compulsory pursuit. A strange anomaly! No other worker is subject to such a restriction. The laborer, the teacher, the professional man, offers his services to those who desire them, and is accepted or rejected according to his ability and the condition of the labor market. Unfortunately for women there is always a flood in the market of marriageable girls; and since any direct display of talents and fitness is forbidden, women have but one alternative—to wait.

To be sure, fond mammas occasionally make disingenuous, hesitating efforts to advance their daughters' matrimonial interests. Thackeray puts the matter very well in commenting on the efforts of the orphan, Becky Sharp, to get herself a husband.

"Though the task of husband-hunting is generally, and with becoming modesty, entrusted by young persons to their mammas, recollect that Miss Sharp had no kind parent to arrange these matters for her. What causes young people to 'come out' but the noble ambi-

tion of matrimony? What sends them trooping to watering-places? What keeps them dancing till five o'clock in the morning through a whole mortal season? What causes them to labor at pianoforte sonatas, and to learn four songs from a fashionable master at a guinea a lesson? What causes respectable parents to take up their carpets, set their house topsy-turvy, and spend a fifth of their year's income in balls and suppers and iced champagne? Is it sheer love of their species, and an unadulterated wish to see young people happy and dancing? Psha! they want to marry their daughters."

In order to minimize the chances of failure in this trade which women must follow but may not profess, the education of girls has been directed with this object in view—to enable them to marry.

Only one ware may be publicly offered by the female —her charm, and the process of attaining this much prized virtue is the work of years. Charm, says Barrie in "What Every Woman Knows," is what every woman needs. If she has it, she needs nothing else —if she does not have it, other virtues are unavailing. Those fortunate ones who are blessed with the charm of physical attractiveness, usually depend for matrimonial success upon beauty of face and form. To this end they deck and adorn themselves. Others who lack personal attractiveness, but who possess a cheerful, happy disposition, seek to develop a bright, vivacious manner. Still others try to develop talents. Mary is taught to play the piano, Alice the mandolin,

while Sarah learns to warble a few plaintive ditties. Such instruction is rarely given, let it be said, with any idea that the young ladies in question will make of such pursuits their life work. Life work indeed! My Mary work? Horrible thought! Any musical talent really worth development is unusual; yet girls are given as children lessons in music, art or some other artistic pursuit that they may be prepared to shine socially. Some girls endeavor to develop a good physique, and practise tennis and horseback riding assiduously,—of recent years, men have begun rather to admire good health and physical development in women. Finally, a few women, possessing only mental ability, are unwise enough to think that the average man wants a brilliant mind in a life companion. In short, the average girl seeks, in so far as her talents lie, to approximate to the standard of womanhood set by the majority of men, since the greater the number of her admirers, the greater her opportunity for a satisfactory choice.

Whatever the training of the girl may be, there is always the possible husband lurking in the background, pictured successively as a minister, a doctor, a great general, or a member of the nobility. The profession is apt to change half a dozen times in the course of twenty years, but the being is there, approving or disapproving of her conduct and inevitably by his preferences, guiding her training. The boy is trained to be a carpenter or sailor, as his talents, desires and opportunities may dictate, but the girl,

whatever her talents, whatever her desires, is trained or else given over untrained to marriage.

Ideally as the state of marriage may be pictured in poetry, in novels, and in polite conversation, there are certain disadvantages in this trade, which in their sum total do not exist in any other single occupation. In the first place, it usually involves dependence, whether she be the wife of a poor or a rich man. Whether her services to her husband and family be of real value or a minus quantity, the average woman is paid only in the wages of subsistence. It is not because of her earning capacity, but because of the generosity of her husband that she receives the five, ten or fifty dollars a week which is hers to spend entirely as she pleases. In fact her allowance is usually in inverse ratio to the services rendered. This lack of a budget is the culminating point in woman's dependence.

If we examine the so-called happy marriages we find them seldom based on the comradeship of equal minds, but rather on the extension by men toward women of the kindness and affection which they would show to any lovable pets or creatures. John Stuart Mill declares of his day that "marriage is the only actual form of serfdom recognized by law. Man's much lauded chivalrous attitude toward women is not based on respect. It is merely a remnant of the days of mediaeval romance, when men paid tribute not to real flesh and blood women, but to their vague ideals. Beatrice to Dante, or Laura to Petrarch, was not a woman to be loved, married and lived with on equal

terms, but rather a symbol of abstract beauty and perfection."

Romeo states the concept very well when he says:—

"She hangs upon the cheek of night
Like a rich jewel in an Ethiop's ear—
Beauty too rich for use,
For earth too dear."

As subsequent events proved, this star-crossed lover was much more apt at dying than at living for his lady.

Woman is no longer an incomprehensible shadowy creature to be worshiped, nor is she a helpless female needing protection, but an individual with all the potentialities of any human being,—whether male or female. As a muscle degenerates from lack of use, as the fish in Mammoth Cave lack eyes to see the daylight with which they never come in contact, so does woman lose her capabilities when they are denied opportunity to develop. Her work is in the home, in entire isolation; she has no contact with her peers in the work of the world. Her children are in school; her husband at his office or shop. Her real social contact is practically limited to that which she has during leisure hours, for purely recreative purposes. As a result she narrows inevitably. Her viewpoint becomes entirely individual and she incapable of real coöperative effort.

Finally her training to consider marriage as her trade has made of woman an unskilled worker in all other occupations. The percentage of women returned as occupied in the census of 1900 is about 34. This

does not mean that only one-third of the women work. It means that a large proportion of girls enters a trade to remain there only for a few years, almost invariably leaving upon marriage. In fact "the largest class of women in the country is represented by the woman who, from 14 to 15, or even younger, goes out as a servant or works in a factory, mill or workshop, for seven or eight years, and looks forward to marriage as the natural termination of her industrial career."

Woman not only deserts her occupation for marriage,—at the end of about twenty years of married life, she frequently reënters the industrial arena. The serious difficulty of this double necessity for adjustment is entirely underestimated. She must change from an industrial to a domestic worker or vice versa—she must change from a woman working supposedly for love, following her own methods with her time allotted as she deems best, to a cog in the great industrial machine requiring regularity, skill and concentration. The habits formed in the years of domestic life not only fail to help her in industrial life but prove a serious hindrance. Is it remarkable that women are generally unskilled workers?

It is not marriage in itself that is responsible for all these results—not marriage but the fact that marriage is regarded as a trade—as a pursuit which must be followed to the exclusion of other regular work.

The remedy lies in woman's own hands. There is no inherent reason why marriage should not be merely an incident in her life as it is in the life of the man,—

no reason why she should not adopt a profession and follow it through life,—with the possible interruption of a few years, if she becomes a mother,—just as a man pursues his trade. True, she will have to combat the old-time tradition that women who do any work outside their homes must inevitably neglect them. But may not the home of the woman who works be the new kind of home—that based upon ideals and common interests rather than upon material drudgery? A few women have proved that it can be done. Such women as the noted singer Madame Gadski tell us that marriage and motherhood need not be a hindrance, but may rather be an inspiration to professional or industrial work. This need prevent no women who delight in domestic science from adopting that as their occupation, but it will no longer put before women as a class the equivalent of Hobson's choice—Marriage as a trade.

N. B.—I wish to render due thanks to Cicely Hamilton for her suggestive book "Marriage As a Trade," from which I have taken the title for this chapter.

CHAPTER XI

THE HOME TRAINING OF THE GIRL

WORDSWORTH says "the child is father to the man," probably unconsciously emphasizing the male child as the propagator of the next generation. If he had referred instead to the girl, he might have said that not only was she the mother but the educator of the next generation. Obviously the training of this feminine power which is to be the creative agent as well as the trainer and guide of those unborn, is of the utmost importance.

The so-called feminine nature has unfortunately been misunderstood for so long, that the shibboleth of prejudice is most difficult to destroy. "What is now called the nature of women is an eminently artificial thing—the result of forced repression in some directions, and unnatural stimulation in others. It may be asserted without scruple, that no other class of dependents have had their character so entirely distorted from its natural proportions by their relation with their masters; for, if conquered and as slave races have been, in some respects, more forcibly repressed, whatever in them has not been crushed down by an iron heel has generally been let alone, and if left with any liberty of development, it has developed itself according to its

own laws; but in the case of women, a hothouse and stove cultivation has always been carried on of some of the capabilities of their nature, for the benefit and pleasure of their masters."[1] The importance, therefore, of removing this unnatural environment and developing all the best that really lies latent in the girl cannot be overestimated.

Let us begin with the most obvious quality in the young child, its physical nature. Our civilization has evolved a strange differentiation in the development of the physique of the boy and the girl. From babyhood the boy is encouraged to romp and play and develop physically; while the girl, until very recently, was invariably urged to be neat and clean, to be a little lady—in other words, to atrophy hopelessly.

There is a marked difference in many of the essentials of childhood which are provided for the two sexes, as for example, in the toys and clothes. The boy has his ball, his top and his drum, his tools, his engine and his toy automobile. He throws his ball, he spins his top, he beats his drum, his childish ingenuity puzzles over the intricacies of the engine, and he likes to "see the wheels go round." He makes a noise and is usually sent out of doors where he can romp to suit his own free will.

The girl, on the other hand, has her dolls, with possibly a toy bed or bureau or trunk. She dresses her dolls, she puts them to bed and puts away their

[1] "Subjection of Women," John Stuart Mill, New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1870, pp. 38-39.

clothes. Each day, instead of beginning in her play as does the boy, where he stopped the day before, she begins just where she started the day before, and repeats the dressing and undressing process endlessly. Her progress in really effective methods of play is obviously nil.

As the boy is expected to run and climb, suitable clothes are provided. His knickerbockers are of some heavy material that will not tear easily, and of some dark color, that shows few marks of soil. The girls, until a few up-to-date mothers decided to put them in "rompers" or "johnnies," wore thin dresses, usually of some light color, with lace not only on the dresses, but on the petticoats and underwear. The scolding that results from a rent in Mary's skirt is scarcely an incentive to active play.

The playground of the lightly clad, doll-surrounded girl is within doors. While the boy becomes hardy from exposure, the girl becomes delicate from the enervating air of an artificially heated house. The trouble of bundling her up before she goes out of doors in all of the necessary leggings, gloves, furs and overshoes, is so great that she cannot run in and out at will as does her brother. She is apt, therefore, to follow the line of least resistance and stay inside, particularly if the weather shows any indication of inclemency.

In the physical ideals presented to the boy and girl the distinction of sex is paramount. The boy is taught to despise the "sis" who is "tied to his mother's apron-

string." If the girl is neat and clean, her mother seldom takes an interest in her muscle. For her, physical ideals are conspicuously lacking.

J. H. Huxley in his "Science and Education," thus characterizes the situation: "Naturally not so firmly strung nor so well balanced as boys, girls are in great measure debarred from the sports and physical exercises which are justly thought absolutely necessary for the full development of the vigor of the more favored sex. Women are, by nature, more excitable than men —prone to be swept by tides of emotion, proceeding from hidden and inward as well as from obvious and external causes; and female education does its best to weaken every physical counterpoise to this nervous mobility—tends in all ways to stimulate the emotional part of the mind and stunt the rest."[1]

The question of a playground for the city girl is a very difficult one. In view of the fact that our common ideal of a home is the abode of a married couple who have or will have children, the woeful lack of provision for the needs of the child in the construction of the modern city home is at least surprising. Huge real estate signs advertise the bathroom, the bedrooms, the dining room and kitchen, the library and reception hall. But where is the children's room? If it exists at all, it is usually some back room in an upper story which is given to them because it cannot be used for anything else. Owners do not care to rent houses to

[1] "Science and Education," J. H. Huxley, New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1901, pp. 71-78.

people having children. Many of the apartment houses, indeed, exclude children as they exclude dogs or other objectionable animals.

The end of this short-sighted policy is close at hand. Already there are many women brave enough to face social criticism, who convert their best and largest room into a real gymnasium where the girls as well as the boys can play on horizontal bars, climb ropes, swing on rings and play basket ball, without the danger of breaking a picture or knocking over an ornament. With this change comes the elimination of the troublesome skirt for the growing girl and the adoption of rompers or bloomers made of some serviceable material.

Where open space about the home permits of out-of-door sports, girls are beginning to play tennis and baseball, to run, jump and climb. Unfortunately few parents are able really to direct the play of their children,—this task must be left to the schools and public playgrounds. In one enterprising community, however, where a few mothers are attempting to coöperate in organizing the play of their boys and girls, a private playground has been obtained, and a mother is on duty morning and afternoon,—not to run the playground as an outsider, but to be one of the children, to suggest and advise only where assistance is requested. The fondness of the children for the playground is ample evidence of its success.

As a matter of fact, really wideawake parents are beginning everywhere to attempt the shaping of a

policy of physical training of children, irrespective of sex. Opportunity is given to the girl as well as the boy to develop not only muscle and strength, but powers of skill, dexterity and endurance.

Next in importance to physical well-being is a healthy knowledge on the part of every girl of her bodily functions. General hygiene is already taught, though hesitatingly, in most schools; but the development of sex hygiene as a science is of fairly recent date, and the place and time for it are still matters of discussion. Were it not for the backwardness and ignorance of parents, the ease of teaching sex hygiene in the home would relieve the school of any responsibility; but parents generally refuse to discuss sex questions with their children, and deeply resent interference. Both boys and girls gain at a remarkably early age a considerable amount of sex knowledge. The important thing is not whether, but where and how they gain it. The large majority of them, I feel convinced, are not instructed by their parents in really healthy knowledge of self, but by servants and other children whose own ignorance makes the information largely unreliable, and by those who deliberately distort the facts.

The responsibility for sex education is, in the end, a parental one. In giving information, the parent must go more than halfway. The time for teaching sex hygiene is not at the arbitrary age of thirteen or ten or six years, but at the age when the individual child begins to question. The little girl who is told

to "run away and play" when she asks where her baby brother came from, does not go back to her mother with her next question. She seeks some other source of information, whose suitableness is usually open to question.

The necessity of a healthy knowledge of self on the part of every growing girl hardly needs emphasis, since the well-being of a large part of her life may depend upon the health habits which she establishes during the period of puberty. Positive wrongdoing or negative neglect is more often the result of ignorance than of intent.

After the physical well-being of the growing girl is provided for, there comes the obvious necessity of character training. Character, it is true, is in a process of constant evolution, and is influenced and changed every year and every decade by environmental circumstances. But the real working basis for character is developed in early youth and is dependent usually upon home influence.

I disagree with those who believe that hardship necessarily ennobles character. It just as often embitters it. But the necessity for daily constructive effort, be it the making of a bed, or the cooking for an entire family, so long as it does not exceed the maximum amount of work which the girl is able to perform and still have time for her share of play and education, cannot help but develop and strengthen a feeling of social responsibility,—a feeling that since some part of the home activities depends absolutely upon her that

she is an essential unit in the family life. This primary concept of working for the group, if once inculcated, is well nigh ineradicable. Such social activities must, however, appear in the light of a privilege, rather than an onerous duty. Wherever practical, the task should be made to suit the inclination of the girl, since work that is done willingly and with interest is always far better done than the unpleasant task.

A really comprehensive attempt in the home to strengthen the character of the girl would include the inculcation of those characteristics in which women are supposed to be lacking, to counteract, in other words, the so-called feminine weakness, such as timidity, lack of initiative, blind submission to authority and pure physical cowardice. It cannot be too often stressed, however, that the child, whether boy or girl, learns in the long run not from the precepts but from the examples of those with whom she comes in contact.

As an element of character, I shall venture to isolate that of individual independence. The influence of the ages has resulted in making woman dependent. The boy from his babyhood is asked what he intends to do when he grows up. The girl is never really made to feel that she must stand on her own feet. She is brought up to expect that her father will support her until she can find a husband. He, in return for whatever service she can render in his home, will support her so long as she is in need of his assistance. Woman as an independent individual, following an

occupation of her own choosing, is an ideal rarely impressed upon the mind of the growing girl; yet it is an essential to the ultimate independence of women.

Finally, in this home training of girls, the coöperation of the father is needed. Just as most of the women's colleges realize the desirability of having men as well as women instructors, so parents should realize that in the home the viewpoint of the father, broadened by his wider contact with the world, is as necessary an element in the training of the girls, as is the mother's influence in the training of the boy.

CHAPTER XII

SCHOOL TRAINING

It is hard to realize that the education of girls and women is a comparatively recent innovation; yet it is a fact that the first grammar and elementary schools in our colonial days were intended only for the education of boys; and the early public schools in England provided no opportunity whatever for the education of girls. Education was not considered necessary for women; in fact some men really doubted whether women were capable of education.

Meantime the wheels of the Gods were grinding out the concept of the individual capacity of Woman. Girls were admitted to the primary and elementary schools, and permitted to learn the three R's along with their sewing and dancing and lessons in deportment; then other branches were opened to them, until at present the school system, both public and private, presents practically identical elementary curricula for boys and girls, often in the form of co-education. But there still lingers a trace of the old idea that education is more necessary to the boy than to the girl—an idea admirably expressed by Ruskin in his "Sesame and Lilies." "A girl's education should be nearly, in its course and material of study, the same as a boy's; but

quite differently directed. A woman, in any rank of life, ought to know whatever her husband is likely to know but to know it in a different way. . . . Speaking broadly, a man ought to know any language or science he learns, thoroughly,—while a woman ought to know the same language, or science, only so far as may enable her to sympathize in her husband's pleasures and in those of his best friends." The essential difference in the spirit behind the education of boys and girls cannot be better illustrated than by a speech delivered by Mr. John Burns to the "Children of the State" at the North Surrey District School in 1909. To the boys he said, "I want you to be happy craftsmen, because you are trained to be healthy men." To the girls, "To keep house, cook, nurse and delight in making others happy is your mission, duty and livelihood."

The object of education according to Herbert Spencer is "preparation for complete living"—an attempt to realize all the potentialities of the individual. As applied to women this would include such physical training as to make every atom of her physical energy and power of endurance contribute toward some definite result, whether it be further physical development or some concrete achievement. It would include the full development of whatever mental power she might possess. Finally, what is of most practical importance, it would include some occupational training so that she might perform her work in the world,—whether it be that of cook, mother, or business woman,—as a trained worker.

In what respect does the present school curriculum fulfil these ideals?

The physical training given to girls in our modern schools is entirely inadequate. This is particularly unfortunate because of the great importance of physical education for girls in preparation for future motherhood. Stanley Hall in his "Adolescence," lays especial stress upon the need of a well-balanced physical life for the adolescent girl. "The more scholastic the education of women," he says, "the fewer children and the harder, more dangerous, and more dreaded is parturition, and the less the ability to nurse children. Not intelligence but education by present man-made ways is inversely as fecundity."[1]

In his outline of an ideal institution for the training of girls from twelve to twenty, Dr. Hall makes the following suggestions,—"That the training should be in the country, in the midst of the hills, the climbing of which is the best stimulus for heart and lungs, and tends to mental elevation and breadth of view. There should be water for boating, bathing and skating, aquaria and aquatic life; gardens both for kitchen vegetables and horticulture; forests for their seclusion and religious awe; good roads, walks, and paths that tempt to walking and wheeling; playgrounds, and space for golf and tennis . . . yet not too great remoteness from the city for a wise utilization of its advantages at intervals."[2] In short, while girls are

[1] "Adolescence," G. Stanley Hall, New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1908, Vol. II, p. 614.

[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, pp. 636-45.

being educated they should live. Such an equipment for the physical education of nine-tenths of our girls is, however, out of the question as a practical method. The vast majority must rely upon the facilities offered by the ordinary public or private schools, inadequate and incomplete as they are.

The inadequacy of the educational system is popularly attributed to two factors,—lack of time and lack of money. For really effective physical training a well equipped gymnasium or athletic field is necessary. But the different kinds of apparatus are expensive, out-of-door space, and often indoor space is limited, and the girls' physical training where it exists at all is usually reduced to a mild and ineffective form of calisthenics. For younger children, the system of kindergartens developed under Froebel's plan is admirable. For older children public playgrounds are being gradually introduced into the large cities; yet most of the facilities there for exercise are intended for or monopolized by the boys. The school gardens form an excellent opportunity not only for physical exercise but for practical education in horticulture and agriculture. Unfortunately few schools are provided with them.

The plea of no time for physical exercise is laughable to any one who is familiar with the undue amount of mental effort required of the growing girl, particularly in the high schools. Yet the educator that develops the brain at the expense of the body is usually the one to plead no time for physical education. The general tendency, however, to discount the impor-

tance of this training for girls is fortunately decadent.

The present mental preparation of our girls for "complete living" particularly in the higher grades, is open to considerable censure. The great conscientiousness of girls, in regard to their lessons, has made them particularly susceptible of imposition in the matter of home work, hence the tremendous mental pressure which is borne by the ambitious girl who desires to excel in her classes. As a student in the High School, I remember spending day after day of five hours in school, nearly two hours going and coming, and six or eight hours of preparation at home. If eight hours is allowed for sleep, and one or two for eating, it is easily seen how little time remains. And I think I was not the exception among those who were preparing for college. In the General Courses the pressure was slightly less severe, but the number of branches studied rendered thoroughness in any one almost impossible. No wonder Herbert Spencer spoke so feelingly of the "flat-chested girl who survives our high pressure education."

The difficulty in the lower grades lies not so much with the mental pressure, as in the lack of elasticity in the work. The elementary classes in the public schools are usually so large (averaging more than forty in all of the leading American cities) that any individualization of the scholar is impossible; and be the child brilliant or stupid, slow to think or quick to jumping at conclusions, he is expected to take in the same facts in the same way, and produce the same result. And

the result is the same. It is universally deadening.

Hand in hand with recent attempts at improving the health of our school children, have gone various improvements in the school curricula. The keen sense of the esthetic which women so generally possess has never been cultivated within even speaking distance of its possibilities. Educators who have begun to realize this are attempting to remedy the situation, and the study of music and art has been introduced, often, to be sure, in a very crude form. The kindergartens are far more effective in this direction than the more advanced grades. They have made really constructive attempts to develop discrimination both of the eye and the ear in recognizing color and harmony, grace of form and movement. The effort is still in its infancy and offers an open field to the enterprising educator.

In occupational training both public and private schools are almost entirely lacking. School teaching is the only pursuit for which any extended preparation is given. Along more practical lines, the teaching of domestic science has been limited so far to elementary courses in sewing and cooking. A laboratory is of course necessary for cooking, but the apparatus is usually limited to a stove plus the necessary pots and pans. A course in cooking to be effectual needs a foundation in the fundamentals of chemistry, and ample opportunity to test food values and the chemical properties of foods. The ordinary courses offered in sewing usually give only the simplest elements, and attempt no training in the designing or construction of clothes.

The necessity for really thorough training in domestic science in the school is scarcely realized. It is particularly important for the girl who goes, at fourteen or sixteen, from the school to the store or factory, and who leaves behind her any opportunity to secure practical training in domestic economy. Unfortunately, however, the realization of the importance of domestic training is apt to be underestimated by the girls who have not actively felt its need. Some incentive is needed to arouse their interest when they are still young enough to profit by any advantages offered in the regular school courses. Nebraska, for example, has an annual corn cooking contest among the children of the public schools. The Western states, it may be noted, have left their Eastern sisters far behind them in really effectual training in domestic arts and sciences.

In the matter of hand training of girls—that is, training in skill and dexterity—only the kindergartens have made even a beginning. Here the basket-weaving, elementary designing and raffia work correspond roughly to the manual training given to the boys in the higher grades. With the exception of drawing, however, practically no opportunity is given to the girl after she leaves the kindergarten to develop manual dexterity and skill.

The teaching of sex hygiene is still another element of education yet in its infancy. Doubtless some will advocate the home as the most fitting place for such instruction. Yet during the years in which such

instruction has been delegated to the home, the latter has failed ignominiously to fulfil its duty. The investigations made by Judge Lindsey among the school children of Denver and by Judge Mack among the children of Chicago, reveal the most astounding ignorance in this respect among parents.

Miss Agnes Torelle has made an attempt at teaching sex hygiene as a supplement to zoölogy. Her success in arousing the interest of the children, in giving them a really scientific knowledge of sex matters from which to draw their conclusions is deserving of wide imitation.

Unfortunately our ideas of modesty make us hopelessly conservative along this line, and render progress exceedingly difficult. In one of our best known women's colleges the teaching of sex hygiene by an able woman physician was objected to so strenuously by some of the parents, that the trustees decided to remove the offending instructor. Yet a few of our best educators are coming to see the paramount importance of such instruction not only in the college but in the school.

Finally, the last topic to find its way into our courses for female education will probably be that of,—shall I call it civics, political economy or citizenship? At any rate, I mean such a course of study which shall enable the girl, not to recite verbatim the articles and amendments of the Constitution in whose interpretation the most august Judges are unable to agree, but to understand wherein lies her particular duty to her

country, state and city; to realize that Patriotism does not consist in waving a flag to the tune of Star Spangled Banner, and at the same time selling coal at a cheaper rate to the fleets of the enemy than to the national government, or delivering defective ammunition and putrid potted ham to those who have offered to die for their country. Let them read such a book as Bryce's "American Commonwealth," and find wherein our glorious American liberty really consists. Let them learn the particulars of the white slave traffic and its intimate connection with politics. Only the citizen with a realization of the defects of a government can help to reform it. Women are famous house-cleaners. Let them be prepared in the school to house-clean the state as well as the home, so that when the time comes for them to cast their vote they may do so wisely, judiciously and effectively.

The defects in our school system are grave, but they can be eradicated. The new spirit is moving everywhere. Women are individuals, capable of education. As such they merit a consideration which they are now in a fair way to receive. If present indications may be trusted, the educational system will, in the course of the next half century, be so shaped as to prepare girls physically and mentally to realize fully the potentialities of their lives.

CHAPTER XIII

COLLEGE EDUCATION FOR GIRLS

WHEN Harvard University was founded at Cambridge, the proposition of instituting a parallel course of instruction for young women would have been greeted with as much ridicule as a proposition to establish a similar institution for negro slaves. Higher education was considered entirely superfluous for women. Even after the first American colleges for men had been started, Mrs. John Adams wrote: "Female education in the best families goes no farther than writing and arithmetic, and in some few rare instances music and dancing."

Women accepted as inevitable this attitude toward the education of the sexes, and were slow to develop any feeling of protest. Discontent was eventually aroused in a few individual cases, where a particularly enterprising and ambitious young woman insisted upon receiving with her father, brother or husband instruction in some part of the hitherto forbidden field of knowledge. Individual women sought, and in some cases obtained, permission to enter men's colleges. Credit for the work performed was denied, however, and diplomas universally refused.

Finally it became apparent to those who desired to

offer college education to women generally, that there was little hope of coöperation with the men's colleges then in existence. The movement toward founding independent women's colleges was the result

In all, four methods have been followed in procuring college education for women.

1. The establishment of colleges exclusively for women;

2. The opening of new institutions with equal rights to both sexes;

3. The admission of women to existing colleges for men on equal or unequal terms;

4. The establishment of women's annexes to the larger universities for men.

Under the first method, followed principally in the eastern part of the United States, the colleges of Mt. Holyoke, Vassar, Smith, Wellesley, Bryn Mawr, the Woman's College of Baltimore, and a number of others were established, and now offer the best collegiate training for women that can be secured in the Eastern States.

Under the second and third methods, followed largely in the Western States, there has sprung up an extended system of co-education in universities controlled and directed by the State. The Universities founded in the West since 1871 started as co-educational institutions. Co-education in the Eastern United States is strictly limited. A few of the larger colleges for men, notably Cornell and Pennsylvania, have granted admission to women under rather unfavorable

circumstances, limiting them to certain courses. Some independent institutions, such as Swarthmore, Oberlin and Bucknell, were co-educational from the start, but the general Eastern sentiment is against college co-education.

Under the fourth method there have come into existence independent woman's colleges, affiliated with certain men's universities, and enjoying the advantages of their faculty and equipment. These seem to offer the best method for granting women the advantages of a large university, in which the sentiment against co-education is so strong that few women dare face the disapprobation heaped upon the "co-ed." Barnard as an annex to Columbia, and Radcliffe as an annex to Harvard, are the most prominent examples of this type of women's colleges.

Whether the education of the women be in a co-education or separate institution, the objects to be attained are the same. College training is primarily cultural. According to tradition, culture can be acquired only through a classical education, founded on Greek, Latin and Higher Mathematics. The modern system of training for culture is more constructive, and follows the newer historic method of studying the past, not as isolated episodes, but as related to the present and bearing upon the evolution of civilization. In reality, the culture inculcated by the present-day college comes more from the daily contact with cultured men and women, than from any specific studies.

The object most usually sought by the college for

women is the development of the intellect, and increase of the fund of information at the command of the individual. This, in reality, is a purely mechanical and much over-estimated process, because the importance of a volume of knowledge as an end in itself, affording an opportunity to indulge at will in mental gymnastics, is of little practical value. It is notable that the close students, the "greasy grinds" of college, rarely stand high in later years. The ability to apply an available stock of information to the daily problems is the faculty that really counts in effective living.

A much underestimated object of the college for women is the physical development of the individual. The importance of this might seem so obvious as to need no mention, yet it cannot be too often asserted nor too thoroughly understood that the power of the girl to apply to her after life the benefits which she gains from a college education depends almost absolutely upon the preservation of her physical health.

This physical education and development is most thoroughly accomplished in the separate college for women where every opportunity for gymnasium work and out-of-door exercise can be made a fundamental part of the college regimen. In Bryn Mawr College, for example, each student is required to perform at least four periods of exercise each week,—a period consisting of violent exercise for half an hour, or of less violent exercise such as walking, for an hour and a quarter. She may indulge at her discretion in hockey, tennis, basket-ball, lacrosse or cricket when

the weather permits, or in swimming, fencing, fancy dancing, indoor baseball, track, heavy or light gymnasium work, when outdoor exercise is impossible or undesirable.

The most practical object of a college education is obviously vocational. The field offered, however, is not usually wide. School teaching is the occupation for which college best fits the average woman; nevertheless a girl with special ability will often be enabled, as a result of her college training, to enter more or less successfully literary work, social work, or even scientific pursuits. A practical geologist or chemist, however, usually needs post-graduate as well as undergraduate work. In fact for any expert practical work outside of the teaching profession, a college training is but a preliminary step.

Modern college education for women, with intellectual, cultural or purely vocational objects in view is attended by several disadvantages. In the first place, the curriculum of the woman's college is merely an imitation of that formerly designed for the man's college, without even a superficial adjustment to sex. A moderately difficult, varied and inclusive course of study for the average man, who discriminates between what he wishes to learn and that about which he refuses to be bothered, is calamitous to the average non-discriminating, over-conscientious college woman. A real lack of balance results from this overdevelopment of the intellect, without a corresponding opportunity to meet people in the every-day affairs of life. The

average college girl, in other words, is as theoretical as the average college boy is practical.

The significance of this tendency toward intellectualization is entirely underestimated. Keeping in mind Herbert Spencer's definition of education as a preparation for complete living, we must conclude that any force which directs the individual toward a biased view of life, however cultural or intellectual the force may be, detracts from the foundation of real education. A preparation for complete living involves a normal development of the power of discrimination. If the girl fails to gain this discriminating power in college, she invariably finds it impossible in after years to put her theories into practice. Without the power to mold her theories to suit the facts, she must either work without balance or discard her theories.

A frequent accompaniment of this one-sided intellectual development of the average college girl is physical disability, due to an overwrought nervous system. I do not refer here to cases of absolute nervous prostration which are fortunately very infrequent among college women, but to the tendency toward "nerves" or susceptibility to nervous excitement exhibited in so many highly intellectual women. The importance of this is only fully realized when we come to the question of motherhood. A celebrated surgeon recently told me that college women invariably had great difficulty with child-birth. Unfortunately physicians seem unable to decide to what extent this is a case of cause and effect. But the fact

remains the same. The large-headed child of the intellectual woman is a common phenomenon, and the women who seem to be best fitted to rear the children of the next generation seem at the same time to be less able to give them birth. If college education as it now exists is an impediment to motherhood, it merits radical and immediate readjustment.

There is some strange inconsistency between the marvelous advance in the profession of surgery, and the comparative lack of knowledge in the fields of obstetrics. It will probably remain for the one who is most directly concerned, the college woman, to reconcile motherhood and college education.

The most fundamental benefit resulting from college education for women is practice in coöperation. Women have so long lived isolated lives that their inability to coöperate has become an accepted feminine characteristic. The average woman, unless she be engaged in commercial business, has practically no opportunity to work coöperatively with her peers. With other women her bond of common work and interest where daily personal contact is possible, is confined to the church and our so-called "society"; with men it is usually limited to her husband, father or brothers. College gives to girls their first, to some their only chance, to work coöperatively with their equals in years and capacity; to develop a real feeling of group solidarity,—even an *esprit de corps* of sex. College life tends to destroy the petty meanness and jealousies of which women are so often guilty,—

indeed, the class spirit and college spirit, which merges the individual on the whole, which sacrifices the good of the individual for the good of the group, is what women need above all things for their coming participation in life.

Another advantage of a college education is training in self-reliance, and as a usual outcome, the attainment of personal self-sufficiency. The individual college girl has no longer her home, her parents, her wealth, or her social position to rely upon. She must stand on her own feet, and make good or fail on her own merits. This dilemma has the disadvantage of showing up the weak and deficient, but as destruction must always precede construction, even the weak are eventually benefited.

The effect of a college education on marriage (not motherhood) is an interesting one, and almost universally misunderstood. Statistics are usually quoted to prove that college girls do not marry; that the marriage rate among them is decreasing, and that the marriage rate of college women is less than that of non-college women. The available data do not justify any of these conclusions, but indicate that college has little or no effect on the marriage rate. Even if the assertion proves to be true,—even if the marriage rate among college girls is lower than the rate in a corresponding social group, the result is not necessarily calamitous.

College girls who fail to marry usually do so because they are economically independent, and do not need

marriage as a means of support. Their ideals of a husband are high and they refuse to sacrifice these ideals for purely financial reasons. Fewer marriages, but better ones, is their motto. They usually have some concept of the meaning of eugenics and choose the husband who will be suitable not only as husband but as father.

The men who believe in sowing their wild oats cannot yet reconcile themselves to the new standard required of them by women, and consequently the better educated women may marry less often than their non-college sisters. But this is merely a transitional stage. As the demand grows,—and it is growing,—men will be compelled to meet the requirements of the college-woman standard. Until that time comes, every thinking woman,—whether college or non-college, will continue to lower the marriage rate.

Lastly, college is an important incentive to the growth of a spirit of social service. Girls learn, many of them for the first time, of the horrible maladjustments of present-day society, and gain, as a corollary to the new range of facts, the inspiration to some kind of social work. Women have much leisure,—far more than men, probably,—hence the crying need is inspiration to some really effective effort. For those forms of work which are directly altruistic, there is no stronger incentive than the ideal of social service so frequently developed by college education.

CHAPTER XIV

TRAINING FOR PROFESSIONS

WOMEN may secure a general education in the Woman's College, but for training in the professions, they must turn to some more specialized educational institution. Opportunity for the professional training of women has broadened remarkably within the past sixty years. The older professional schools have been opened; new courses have been established along similar lines; and entirely new professions have been created in the course of this educational advance.

The first medical school for women was established in Massachusetts in November, 1848. Meanwhile Elizabeth Blackwell had been granted the degree of M. D. at Geneva in 1849, and her sister Emily a like degree at Cleveland, Ohio, in 1852. Through the influence of these women the movement toward opening medical training to women became insistent.

In 1850, through the efforts of Ann Preston, the Woman's Medical College came into existence at Philadelphia. Until 1859 the Philadelphia County Medical Society threatened to excommunicate any physician who might teach in the school and any one else who might even consult the said teachers. The difficulty of obtaining a competent faculty seemed

unsurmountable. Moreover, until the founding of the Woman's Hospital at Philadelphia in 1862, the students had no opportunity for clinical training. In New York, in 1865, a Medical School for women was established, in connection with the Infirmary, under Elizabeth Blackwell. Finally, in 1869, the third Woman's Medical School in the United States, that of Chicago, was opened.

In addition to these three women's colleges, several State Universities, between 1869 and 1875, admitted women on a basis of equality with men. Finally, in 1891, the greatest advance for years was made when Johns Hopkins University opened its medical course to women. This concession was secured largely through the influence of a woman,—Mary E. Garrett of Baltimore, who succeeded in raising $500,000 for the purpose. Thus ample opportunity is now offered to women to obtain the best of medical training.

With the advance in medicine has gone the substitution of the modern trained nurse for the old-fashioned nurse. In this country, the New England Hospital claims priority in providing theoretical as well as practical training for nurses. Since this innovation, 1863, the opportunity for training has rapidly broadened.

Parallel to their success in obtaining thorough medical training, has been the success of women in their effort to secure legal education. One by one, the leading law schools have consented to receive women as students. In addition, a law school for women was

opened in New York, and later affiliated with the University of the City of New York.

The next in order of the old professions is that of the ministry. Here women have signally failed to obtain anything like an equality in training and opportunity. The Universalist Church was the first to open its theological schools to women, and to ordain them by its established forms. The Meadville Theological School (unitarian) has also been opened to women students. But with the exception of a few isolated instances, there is no opportunity for women to obtain ministerial training.

The field of music offers practically equal training to men and women, in both vocal and instrumental work, so that the musically inclined or talented woman has opportunity to cultivate her powers in that direction to the utmost.

In the newer professions, however, women have abundant chance to find a congenial occupation. Teaching, modern sciences, literary work, organized philanthropy, and arts and crafts give a wide opportunity for selection.

More women are engaged in teaching than in all of the other professions combined. Since the Civil War, the schools, particularly the elementary schools, have been turned over to women. The last chapter gave a picture of the opportunities which women's colleges provide for the training of teachers. In addition, normal schools and teachers' training schools, in every state, provide opportunity for this branch of education.

The significance of teaching, to the present and the future, needs no emphasis at this point.

Practically all of the women's colleges offer excellent undergraduate training in the sciences, particularly in chemistry, physics, geology and biology; and the graduate departments of even the most conservative men's universities are open, in these branches, to women students. Here they can utilize the best laboratories and experimental appliances for original research work that the world has to offer. The trained woman chemist of today finds a large field of work open to her, and little difficulty in obtaining employment. The trained physicist is not as much in demand as the chemist, but is becoming increasingly so.

In the field of geology,—and I might add astronomy, in which training is more difficult to obtain,—there is no great opportunity for gainful employment. The field of biology has recently developed a need for trained workers. A thorough knowledge of bacteriology is essential to all food inspectors and analysts. In the modern attempt at preventing adulteration of foods as well as that of providing antitoxins for various diseases, there is an open field for practical original work on the part of a trained biologist. The peculiar capacity of the feminine mind for dealing with details, for properly estimating their importance and for reaching careful and minute conclusions, renders it particularly adapted for the pursuit of those sciences requiring the utmost exactness and conscientiousness. If, therefore, they can obtain the best that there is in pre-

paratory training, the success of women in these professions can be safely predicted.

Perhaps more widely possible and desirable as a practical profession for women are the fields opened up by the developments in modern literature and journalism. The achievements of women litterateurs in the past, when they were ordinarily denied both training and the opportunity for effective work, presages a brilliant career to the women writers of the future, who have the benefit of the training of modern high schools and colleges, as well as that of a freer life which permits them to come more directly into contact with people and to study the psychology of human nature. In the field of journalism, technical training is now being offered, which prepares the men and women who take the courses for repertorial, editorial and magazine work.

For a woman possessing a concise, clear, easy style; a good understanding of people, a quick and imaginative mind,—reporting, journalism and magazine work offer an attractive field.

Mrs. Isabel W. Ball, the first woman to be admitted to the Press Galleries of the Congress of the United States, gives in the following words her view of the essentials for a newspaper woman:

"In the first place, she must be blessed with good common sense; not uncommon sense, for then she will want to go on the managing editor's desk the first thing. She must have powers of observation, command of good newspaper English—not dictionary

English, if you please—and be able to sit down in the middle of a cyclone to note her impressions of the same.

"She must have sound health, a good temper, finesse, and above all things, must learn to forget that she is a woman, when she has to work among men at men's work. I do not mean that she must be unwomanly. Nothing would do more harm than that. But if a man wants to smoke in her presence when she is at work, or keep his hat on, or take his coat off, or put his feet on the desk, or do any of the things which she would order him out of her parlor for doing, she must remember that it all goes with the place she is in."

The financial returns in journalism are usually estimated in proportion to the service rendered, irrespective of age and sex. One woman editorial writer in Chicago draws a salary of $5,000 a year for an average of one column a day. Advance is sometimes slow, but real ability is sure of eventual recognition.

Another branch of literary work offering wide opportunity for women is library work. There are four principal schools for library training in the United States admitting both men and women, but intended primarily for women. The trained librarian is a comparatively recent innovation, but she is one that has come not only to stay, but also to improve her field of labor and enlarge upon it.

Technical training has hardly yet become recognized as a necessary preparation for social work. The New York School of Philanthropy is the pioneer in the field, and offers very valuable instruction in the tech-

nique of social and charitable activities. Similar schools have been conducted with marked success in Boston, Philadelphia, Chicago, St. Louis and other cities. The field here open to women is a broad one, and has the advantage of providing an interesting and profitable profession not only for the highly educated college woman, but for her less educated sisters and friends.

Finally, we come to the possibilities of professional pursuits in the realm of art. In the field of artistic illustration, etching and photography, book making and binding as well as cover designing, interior house decoration, stained and leaded glass work, mural painting, and finally practical designing for textile manufactories or for mural decorations,—in all of these pursuits women may turn their artistic talents and training to a profitable end, without debasing their art. In schools of industrial art and of the fine arts, sex proves no impediment to success in one's chosen profession. Architectural training, moreover, has recently been opened to women at a number of co-educational institutions, such as Pratt Institute in New York.

With a final mention of the stage, and the various schools of Dramatic Art which purport to train and equip actresses for a successful career, the list of professions in which women can obtain adequate training seems exhausted. It is not a long one,—is far too short,—but it offers an ample opportunity for choice to the intelligent young woman who is seeking a congenial career in which she will not be handicapped at the offset by insufficient training and equipment.

CHAPTER XV

WOMAN'S INDUSTRIAL FIELD

HARRIET MARTINEAU, an English woman who visited America in 1840, tells us that she found at that time only seven employments open to women in the United States,—teaching, needlework, keeping boarders, type-setting, work in book-binderies, work in cotton-mills and household service.

The institution of the cotton-mill, the northern complement of the cotton gin, had notably assisted the transferring of work from the home to the factory. The first cotton mill erected in Lowell, Massachusetts, in 1822, was soon followed by others until, in 1839, there were ten companies employing twelve thousand five hundred and seven operatives, the majority of them women. They were a high type class of women, largely from the nearby farms, who had spun and woven in the home, and now followed the spindle and loom from home to factory. The working conditions were good, and the work more or less skilled.

With the improvements in machinery, however, the tendency for many years was to increase the number of unskilled trades open to women, and so to render their position continually more undesirable, and their exploitation easier. The earlier women factory

workers, at least those in the New England Textile Mills, had been educated as thoroughly skilled operatives. With the improvements in machinery came hordes of unskilled emigrants who underbid the American wage rate, taking the positions from the Americans who demanded a higher standard. By 1870, if we may believe newspaper accounts of the day, out of 70,000 women wage-earners in the city of New York, not including domestics, 20,000 were constantly face to face with starvation and pauperism. Seven thousand lived in cellars. Some of them made shirts at six cents apiece, and few workers could make a dozen during one day. Boston, in 1868, showed a similar condition of degraded womanhood.[1]

The United States census figures show that women are engaged in nearly all trades. Of the 369 groups into which industries were divided for census purposes in 1890, women were employed in all but nine. In 1900, there were only four out of the 303 groups of industries in which no women were employed.

The vast majority of women are, according to the census, working in unskilled trades.

In point of numbers, by far the most important occupation for women is that of servant or waitress, the 1,165,561 women reported for this occupation in the census of 1900 constituting one-fourth of the total number in all occupations. Almost a half million women are reported as engaged in agricultural labor,

[1] "Woman's Work in America," Annie N. Meyer, New York, Henry Holt & Co., 1891.

but 96.8 per cent of these are from the Southern States, and 79.3 per cent of the total number were negroes. The next four occupations, similar in numerical importance though of widely different character,—are dressmaking, laundry work, teaching and farming. The next five occupations,—textile mill work, housekeeping, stewardess work, salesmanship and sewing, are again purely industrial occupations. The twelfth group, that of nurses and midwives, includes 108,691 women.

The majority of women, engaged in unskilled industries, could secure no industrial education through their work. In order to raise their standard, and enable them to enter the ranks of skilled workers, where the supply was less than the demand, commercial and industrial schools were established.

A few private industrial schools for women, such as the "Wilson Industrial School" in New York, had been started as early as 1856. But it was not until 1859, with the opening to the public of Cooper Institute, New York, that a really practical opportunity to secure industrial education was open to women. Second among the pioneers, in securing industrial education for women, was the Woman's Christian Temperance Union. Under their superintendence classes were organized in commercial arithmetic, penmanship, bookkeeping and typewriting. An industrial department was also created for the teaching of dressmaking in all its branches of cutting, fitting and hand and machine sewing.

Following along this line, but continually improving the technical facilities and expanding the scope of the training, are the modern technical commercial and industrial schools. Foremost among these stand the Pratt Institute in New York, Drexel Institute in Philadelphia, and the Massachusetts Institution of Technology in Boston. A woman can here obtain the best training for dressmaking, millinery, cooking and domestic science, typewriting and stenography, as well as for a number of the arts and professions.

Similar courses have been introduced into the high schools of the public school system. These provide excellent technical training in stenography, typewriting and business courses, but the field covered is confined to commercial training in its narrowest sense.

Of a somewhat different character is the technical education offered to women by the State colleges and universities of the Western States. Here not only commercial instruction can be obtained, but also thorough courses of preparation in domestic science and in agriculture.

For the woman who desires to enter some form of industrial occupation for which considerable skill is required and for which adequate training is available, the field for choice is thus a wide one. In the department of agriculture, for example, she may specialize in poultry farming, dairying, bee-keeping, stock-breeding. In horticulture she may devote her energies to forestry or village improvement work, market gardening, fruit growing or flower growing. If her tastes

are domestic, the field of domestic science includes culinary and dressmaking courses. At the same time, the many commercial and technical courses offer ample training for the embryo clerical, secretarial or business woman.

The desirability of raising the standard of the unskilled trades was, and is still, almost a necessity in the face of the generally bad conditions under which women work. But the first successful attempt to provide such an opportunity was slow to come. Not until the institution of the Manhattan Trade School in New York was any real chance given to the factory or shop girl to perfect herself in the technique of her trade.

The founders of the Manhattan Trade School aimed to provide a training that would bear directly on the occupational life of the girl. To do this, they visited the leading factories in the neighborhood of the school, and asked the Superintendents,—"What would you like your girls to know?"

Some of the Superintendents laughed; some said that it was impossible to teach factory work in school; but the great majority seeing in the proposed school an opportunity to improve the efficiency of their working force, suggested the lines of work which seemed to them most hopeful in the training of their workers.

The outcome of this coöperation between school authorities and factory superintendents was the establishment of a number of courses in practical work, highly satisfactory to both parties. The school has

provided the theoretical, and some of the practical aspects of a vocation; the factory gives the final instruction in practical work.

While the Manhattan Trade School is perhaps the most successful experiment of its kind in the United States, it has many followers in the Trade Schools which are rapidly springing up in all important industrial centers. In Germany, even greater progress has been made with the Continuation School—intended, like the Manhattan Trade School, to increase working efficiency, but much broader in scope and more effective in its methods of operation.

Industry, through its specialization and standardization, is providing an abundance of opportunity for women. This opportunity, however, is unaccompanied by any adequate facilities, such as those existing under the apprenticeship system, for teaching the worker. Consequently, the school must enter the field, providing a form of technical education that will prepare for and supplement work in standardized industries.

CHAPTER XVI

THE CHOICE OF THE WOMEN OF ROME

THE revolution in the home together with the breakdown of tradition, and the establishment of educational facilities, has reshaped the environmental influences acting upon women until they are presented, for the first time in centuries, with a wide opportunity to choose the pursuits to which their lives shall be devoted. What is involved in this possibility of choice? What are the fields of opportunity lying open before American Women? Let me begin the discussion by contrasting social conditions in Rome,—the greatest republic of antiquity, with the United States,—the greatest republic of modern times.

In both civilizations women were given freedom to make a choice fundamental to national welfare. In Rome they chose; in America they are choosing. What resulted from the choice of the Women of Rome? What hangs upon the choice made by American Women today?

It is not possible, nor is it even desirable, to contend that any parallel that may be drawn between the women of Rome and the women of the United States is conclusive evidence on any subject connected with the latter group. On the other hand, since motives and

actions bore much the same relation to each other in Roman society that they do in present-day American Society, it is reasonable to assert that a given set of conditions in the United States may be followed by consequences similar to those which resulted in Rome from like conditions.

The early years of Roman society were dominated by a puritanism of the most extreme type.[1] The absolute religious faith which permeated the thought and action of the early Romans, resulted in high standards of moral duty, and in religious ideals of the most exalted character. Virtue was insisted upon. Abstinence of every kind was encouraged. The men abstained from delicacies to such an extent that it was considered disgraceful to use Greek wines. High living was strictly forbidden,—a prohibition that was ultimately enforced by statute. The women, in their turn, abstained from luxurious clothing,—living simple, industrious lives within the boundaries of their own homes.

Each member of this early puritanical society was willing to sacrifice individual taste for group welfare. Each individual believed implicitly in the dignity and responsibility of Roman citizenship,—the men fighting for it and the women working for it. The early Romans, in short, held up high ideals of individual conduct and social duty, to which they adhered because the Gods so ordained.

[1] "Puritanism," G. Ferrero, *Atlantic Monthly*, July, 1910, p. 1-6.

Under this social system the Roman matron occupied a position of great economic importance, since practically all industry was carried on under her direction within the home, where she had great authority. She directed the servants, slaves and relatives in their activities,—at times spinning and weaving herself,—produced, with their assistance, the clothing, the food and food products, so that she was entirely responsible for the economic well-being of the household.[1]

Although occupying so important an economic position, the Roman woman was socially dependent, since her life was literally at the disposal first of her father, and later of her husband. Fowler, in describing the early attitude of Roman men toward their women says: "Old Cato represents fairly well the old idea of Roman virtue, yet it is clear enough that his view of the conjugal relation was a coarse one,—that he looked on the wife rather as a necessary agent for providing the state with children than as a helpmeet to be tended and revered."[2]

Here is truly no very exalted concept of womanhood, yet the Roman girls were educated as were the boys. Aside from this early education, however, there seems to have been little desire on the part of the men to foster intellectuality or independence in the women. They were regarded as intellectually inferior

[1] "Social Life at Rome," W. W. Fowler, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1909, pp. 143-4.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 149.

and incapable of effort on a basis of equality with men.[1]

With the advance of Roman civilization, the position of women underwent a fundamental change. In the first place, the introduction of slaves made women economically independent by freeing them from household cares. As the Roman armies conquered province after province, they brought back, as a part of their spoil, multitudes of slaves. Each insurrection, moreover, was punished by the enslavement of the rebellious subjects. In some extreme cases, the poor of Rome sold their children into slavery. All of these causes made slaves cheap; hence they were very generally owned, and as domestics compelled to carry on the productive occupations of the household.[2] Moreover, Rome was becoming rich. Victorious generals invariably returned with enormous wealth, while civil officers, delegated to collect taxes or to administer other governmental functions in the provinces, acquired wealth in a phenomenally short space of time.

The economic basis of women's independence once laid, social independence quickly followed. The matron of early Rome, with her industrious, home-loving disposition, and her simple manners and dress was replaced by women of brilliant social attainments. Contrary to the original custom, women began to acquire property, to indulge in luxurious clothing and

[1] An excellent summary of the subject appears in a "Short History of Women's Rights," Eugene A. Hecker, New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1910.

[2] "Social Life at Rome," W. W. Fowler, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1909, pp. 230-6.

in public display. Writing of this transformation in the life of the woman, Fowler states: "It is not possible here to trace the history of the change in detail, but we may note that it seems to have begun within the household, in matters of dress and expense, and later on, affected the life and bearing of women in society and politics." As women became rich, the law regulating their ornaments and dress was repealed, and divorce "began to be a virtue." During the long wars in the second century B. C. men were away for years at a time. Many died of disease or in battle, leaving the women free and in many cases sufficiently independent to follow their own devices. It is at this epoch that three women of noble rank were tried on the charge of murdering their husbands. "The evidence for the Bacchanalian conspiracy of 186 B. C., in which women played a very prominent part, is explicit, and shows that there was a 'new woman' even then, who had ceased to be satisfied with the austere life of the family . . . and was ready to break out into recklessness even in matters which were the concern of the state. That they had already begun to exercise an undue influence over their husbands, in public affairs, seems suggested by Old Cato's famous dictum that 'all men rule over women; we Romans rule over all men, and our wives rule over us.' "[1]

With economic freedom and its resulting freedom from social bonds, came a loosening of the marriage tie, which proved disastrous to both men and women.

[1] Supra, pp. 146-9.

Marriage became the first step to divorce, and thus led to social freedom. While the unmarried girl was "in the darkest times, as a rule, carefully guarded from the worst corruptions of the spectacles, or from the reckless advances of the hardened libertine," "her temptations and danger often began on her wedding day. . . . A marriage of convenience with some member of a tainted race, blasé with precocious and unnatural indulgence, and ready to concede the conjugal liberty which he claimed, was a perilous trial to virtue. The bonds of old Roman marriage had, for ages, been greatly relaxed, and the Roman lady of independent fortune, and vigorous, highly trained intellect, could easily find consolation for marital neglect."[1]

In addition to this economic and social freedom, women began to exercise an influence in politics. Fowler writes of Sempronia that "she was one of those who found steady married life incompatible with literary and artistic tastes," and adds, "she seems to be one of the first of a series of ladies who, during the next century and later, were to be a power in politics, and most of whom were at least capable of crime, public and private."[2]

A complete transformation had thus come over Roman society. Wealth had increased. Women and men alike, by turning over their work to slaves, had gained boundless leisure. The ancient traditions,

[1] "Roman Society," Samuel Dill, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1905, pp. 84-5.

[2] "Social Life at Rome," W. W. Fowler, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1909, pp. 156-7.

which commanded virtue, duty and abstinence, were ruthlessly overthrown, leaving the Roman woman free to make her choice. On the one hand was the old ideal of virtue, family fealty, and simplicity of life; on the other was economic independence, individual indulgence, and freedom for social and political activity. A life of social usefulness or one of selfish luxury,—which should she elect? Should she indulge her animal passions or develop her instincts for social service?

The women of Rome were called upon to make this fundamental choice between selfishness and social action; between indulgence and service; between Poppaea, the wife of a profligate emperor, and Cornelia, the mother of worthy citizens; between personal adornment and the glory of strong sons and daughters. Their choice is indicated by Fowler, who says of Cornelia: "Such ladies must have been rare, and in Cicero's time hardly to be found."[1]

The Roman woman finally chose childlessness, idleness, luxury and dissipation. Dill writes: "Owing to celibacy and vice, childlessness in that age was extraordinarily common in the upper class. One of the darkest and most repulsive features in that putrescent society was the social value which attached to a vicious and shameful childlessness."[2] Freed from the responsibilities of family life and economically independent, the women of Rome led lives of selfish and

[1] *Supra*, pp. 153-4.

[2] "Roman Society," Samuel Dill, London, The Macmillan Co., 1905, pp. 96-7.

voluptuous pleasure. "While a Musonius or a Seneca was demanding equal chastity in man and woman, the new woman of Juvenal boldly claims a vicious freedom equal to that of her husband.[1]

"In many so-called Christian circles, the gay, supple 'virgin' who would laugh at jests of doubtful freedom, and who had a relish for spiteful gossip, was much more popular than the 'rough and rustic' person whose religion was not a fraud. Many other sketches of female character have been left us by the pencil of St. Jerome—the sot who justifies her love of wine with a profane jest; the great lady, puffed up by the honors of her house, who passes through St. Peter's, attended by a crowd of eunuchs, doling out alms with equal parsimony and ostentation, and repulsing the unfortunate widow with blows."[2] The picture is everywhere drawn, almost without relief, in the darkest hues.

The influence of women may be ennobling. It may furnish high ideals and inspiration to men. On the other hand, their influence may be debasing, if it is used to arouse the lowest passions from which men suffer. Cato may have been right when he said that the Roman women ruled over the men, for he may even then have been suffering defeat at the hands of some brilliant member of the opposite sex. Clearly, however, the women of Rome were given an unequalled opportunity to employ their influence for the

[1] *Supra*, pp. 86-7.

[2] "Roman Society," Samuel Dill, London, The Macmillan Co., 1899, pp. 134-5.

uplifting or the debasing of society, and this opportunity they used for its debasement.

"The human harvest was bad."[1] The fall of Rome was a great confession that she lacked men. Who shall say what part the abdication of intelligent motherhood, the loose, vicious lives of the women, and their selfish indulgence in the most debasing of idle pastimes, may not have had in sowing the seed of that bad harvest?

[1] "The Human Harvest," D. S. Jordan, Boston, Am. Unitarian Assn., 1907, p. 13.

NOTE.—For a brilliant description of the lives of Roman women under the Cæsars, see "The Women of the Cæsars," G. Ferrero, New York, The Century Co., 1911.

CHAPTER XVII

THE AMERICAN WOMAN'S CHOICE

HISTORIC parallels may not justifiably be drawn; Rome was a military, the United States is an industrial nation; modern inventions and discoveries place a wide gulf between the Roman Society of two thousand years ago and the American Society of today; nevertheless, the same choice that confronted the women of Rome is confronting the women of the United States today. Will the American woman choose Selfish Indulgence or Social Service? She may shrink from the decision; she may desire to let events decide for her; she may take refuge in idle excuses and complaints, but even while she hesitates and draws back, circumstances are forcing the choice upon her.

The breadth of this choice varies with the individual and with the income class to which she belongs. The girl born into one of the many families with an income of $10 a week may decide, when she reaches fourteen, what kind of industry she wishes to enter. She can not choose to idle, but, within certain limits, she may choose where she will work. After she has passed her twentieth year, she must choose between marriage and a continuance in industrial life. Among the higher income classes, girls may choose between high school

or even college; between some form of professional or industrial activity, and marriage. Among the middle and upper income groups, the girl may choose between idling or going to college; between engaging in some form of gainful occupation, or marriage. She may even combine several of these pursuits. Among all classes, after marriage, the woman, by her management and her decisions, chooses how the family shall live, how large the family shall be, what attitude its members shall assume toward life.

As income and leisure increase, they broaden the field of choice. Not only does the same dilemma confront the women of the United States that confronted the women of Rome, but it has arisen in a markedly similar way. The women of the United States have passed through similar stages, from puritanical dependence to economic and social freedom; they have been relieved of many of their old responsibilities and duties; they have been educated and received into the professions on an equal basis with men; and now, freed from any necessity, such as the hunger, privation and religious sanctions which drove their ancestors to lives of child-bearing, child care and ceaseless toil, they are confronted with the necessity of making a choice between Selfish Indulgence and Social Service.

The freedom which American Women have gained through recent social changes and the significance of their consequent choice, constitutes one of the profoundest and at the same time one of the most inscrutable problems in American life. The women of the

United States are free to choose. What does their freedom involve, and what will follow from their choice?

In the early days, before the Revolutionary War, a puritanism as severe as that of early Rome dominated the thought of the United States. The call of duty was supreme. All men obeyed it. They worked for duty, dressed for duty, and refrained from laughter on the Sabbath because duty required it. This spirit of puritanism dominated the lives of women as well as of men.

In addition to the puritanical obedience to the dictates of conscience, economic necessity played a leading part in prescribing the rôle of the early Puritan maiden. The country was new and rough,—it must be subdued; families were scantily provided with food, clothes and shelter,—the lack must be supplied. In meeting this necessity the woman played a chief part. She spun; wove; cooked; preserved; made candles; made clothes; took charge of milk, if there was a cow; of eggs, if there were chickens; worked in the fields in summer, and all the year cared for the many children.

There was no delicatessen store on the next block; holeproof hosiery was unknown; clothing factories unheard of; breakfast foods must be cooked; no baker delivered bread each morning at her door. Not one of the modern conveniences, comforts or luxuries presented themselves to the Puritan matron. She must work.

The place of woman in Puritan days was in the home; so too was the place of man. From similar conditions arose the German saying, "An honest woman should keep indoors." The home held almost all of life's activities, pleasures and duties. The home was the center of the world.

Like the Roman matron, two thousand years before, the American matron in Colonial days was an economic factor, contributing her share to the real income of the family. Society and the church prescribed her duties as they had prescribed the duties of her Roman sisters; her conscience directed her daily work; so that she lived a life of simplicity, devotion and earnest labor, little dreaming that her children's children's daughters would be forced to make a choice between home and the outside world; between marriage and industry; between idleness and effort; between Self and Society.

Since the days of Puritan New England, American women have been emancipated. The home has lost its industries, the Church has taken down its restrictions, so that women are at liberty to do as they choose. The stern duty-imposing conscience of the early Puritans has given place to the easy-going pleasure-loving conscience of Twentieth-Century America. Industry has been established on a new basis; the home has been revolutionized, and woman is confronted with hitherto undreamed-of forces.

With her emancipation from exacting economic duties in the home has come the social freedom of woman. She has her own clubs, her own friends, her

own circles; she serves on committees, teaches school, directs philanthropy. Incompatibility is a ground for divorce. The woman, through her wide opportunities for gainful occupation, may easily support herself, independent of her husband. Education, by making women not only free to choose but capable of choosing an occupation, has placed them on a basis of virtual equality with men. Three forces, then, economic evolution, social freedom and education have revolutionized the position of women. The industrial revolution resulted in a domestic revolution, and together they have caused a revolution in woman's sphere and status. The American woman today is well nigh "free and equal" with man. She holds property,—in some States she votes. She has a status in the courts. A myriad of occupations are open to her.

With rights, however, come duties, and if they regard duties as irksome, women will find that there is a thorn for every rose. Each new opportunity carries with it the necessity for choice. The slave alone is free; his master dictates his life; never once is he called upon to make the choices upon which his future depends; but the freeman is bound, unless liberty be interpreted in terms of license, to render an account of his every act. Since he is his own master, he must answer for his own conduct. Under the English Common Law, a married woman was not legally responsible for many of her acts, because she was regarded as having done them under the duress of her husband,—a tradition still lingering in the law of many American

States. Nevertheless, women today are free,—free to choose.

The woman of the United States may, like the women of Rome, choose selfishly. Through all classes of society women may choose single life, with its freedom from care and responsibility. They may continue in industrial pursuits, earning a fair living, and spending it on dress and pleasure. Among the well-to-do, the women may choose lives of idle dependence, living first at the expense of their fathers and later at the expense of their husbands; never engaging in any serious occupations, devoting their lives to the pursuit of that social will o' the wisp mistakenly called Happiness. They may salve their consciences by going to a settlement once a week or attending a charity ball. But deep in their hearts they know, if they ever trouble to look so far, that they are taking more from society in sustenance than they are returning in service; that they are parasites, supported by the workers of the nation.

So chose the women of Rome, at least the women of whom we have any record. They preferred childlessness and gaiety to children and service, so that when the Roman people reaped their harvest, they found that an enemy had sowed tares among the wheat.

Fifty years ago John Ruskin wrote: "Granted, that whenever we spend money for whatever purpose, we set people to work, we will assume that whenever we spend a guinea we provide an equal number of people with healthy maintenance for a given time. But, by

the way in which we spend it, we entirely direct the labor of those people during that given time. We become their masters or mistresses, and we compel them to produce, within a certain period, a certain article. Now, that article may be a useful and lasting one, or it may be a useless and perishable one—it may be one useful to the whole community, or useful only to ourselves.

"Thus, for instance, if you are a young lady, and employ a certain number of sempstresses for a given time, in making a given number of simple and serviceable dresses, suppose, seven; of which you can wear one yourself for half the winter, and give six away to poor girls who have none, you are spending your money unselfishly. But if you employ the same number of sempstresses for the same number of days, in making four, or five, or six beautiful flounces for your own balldress,—flounces which will clothe no one but yourself, and which you will yourself be unable to wear at more than one ball—you are employing your money selfishly. You have maintained, indeed in each case, the same number of people; but in the one case you have directed their labor to the service of the community; in the other case you have consumed it wholly upon yourself. You say to them, 'You shall make nothing but lace and roses for me; for this fortnight to come, you shall work at the patterns and petals and then I will crush and consume them away in an hour.' You will perhaps answer, 'It may not be particularly benevolent to do this, and we won't call it so;

but at any rate we do no wrong in taking their labor when we pay them their wages; if we pay for their work we have a right to it.' No—a thousand times no. The labor which you have paid for does indeed become, by the act of purchase, your own labor; you have bought the hands and the time of those workers; they are, by right and justice, your own hands, your own time. But, have you a right to spend your own time, to work with your own hands, only for your own advantage?—much more, when, by purchase, you have invested your own person with the strength of others; and added to your own life, a part of the life of others? As long as there are cold and nakedness in the land around you, so long there can be no question at all but that splendor of dress is crime."[1]

What a picture! Shadows without relief. "It is painted too black," you exclaim. No, not a whit, it is indeed very dark, but this is only one side of it. Look upon the other side, and you will find it very bright, for the American Woman may choose the bright side of the picture. Every social effort should be bent to lead her to this latter choice, because in it lies at least a measure of social salvation.

First, American Women have opportunity. Educationally, socially, politically, industrially, they are afforded openings for the application of their ability and energy. They have an opportunity to make constant effort, upon which depends character and achieve-

[1] "Political Economy of Art," John Ruskin, Lecture II, "Application."

ment. It is true of any animal that disuse means decay; the arm, held rigid for a year, would prove an indifferent member; this is equally true of any other faculty. Disuse involves decay,—physical, mental, spiritual.

The powers of the will,—the positive forces of the individual which make up character,—are no exception to this rule. The man who idles becomes an idler; the women who make no effort become colorless. Like the unused arm, they degenerate through lack of functioning. The point is obvious, yet it needs strong emphasis in the life of each individual. Dr. G. Stanley Hall holds that such is even more the case with women than with men: "They (women) particularly need absorbing occupations, and are spoiled by idleness and vacuity of mind, which makes them either lazy, phlegmatic and unambitious, or else restless."[1] The disuse of the power to choose wisely will finally incapacitate the individual to make wise choice.

But wise choice we must have. On every side are fields, white for harvest. Never were opportunities for service so great; never was the passion for altruistic effort so rife, so eager for direction; never before, in the history of man have science, invention and discovery opened up such great avenues for the pursuit of knowledge and the application of that knowledge to human affairs; never has there been piled up in any one nation so vast a store of free wealth,—wealth

[1] "Adolescence," G. Stanley Hall, New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1904, Vol. II, p. 578.

which may be directed into any channel that promises high returns in human service. Twentieth Century American society is a city set on a hill, a candle on a candlestick; the whole world is regarding our progress, —applauding and imitating our successes: laughing at and profiting by our blunders. We are making history, whether for the advance or the retardation of mankind,—the history of a democracy, in which each citizen may play a part.

Women are citizens; they have been emancipated; they may,—they must, do their share of the nation's work. They may plunge into reckless extravagance, apeing the fashions, "doing" society, playing cards, visiting dressmakers and milliners, shopping, even dissipating, leading lives of idleness. On the other hand they may choose the better part, assuming their share of the responsibilities of the nation,—bearing and rearing healthy, noble sons and daughters, administering worthy homes, occupying leading positions in industrial, educational and philanthropic ventures; utilizing their time wisely; choosing socially and not selfishly.

Possessed of great capacities, armed with social and industrial choice, the American women of the Twentieth Century are choosing to do the work of the world. The High School is bearing fruit; the Woman's College is exercising its salutary effect, not among its graduates alone, but among thousands who have never been inside its walls; the American Women of the new generation are choosing to work,—and to work at the things which count for most in a nation's life.

CHAPTER XVIII

SELECTION,—A BASIC FACTOR IN PROGRESS

ALTHOUGH the terms "Heredity" and "Environment" have been grossly overworked, there are none which serve so well to describe the two general directions in which women may influence the race. Both the characteristics which are transmitted through heredity and the characteristics which are the product of environment are in a measure, within woman's power. Blue eyes, a talent for music, a love of the beautiful, may be handed down as a heritage from parent to child. Strong bodies, alert minds, sympathy, and strength of character may be imparted by judicious training. Environment is far reaching in its influence, but heredity is fundamental.

All hereditary characteristics are furnished to the offspring by the parents. These characteristics may have arisen long before the parents were born, and may have continued in the family for generations, but the hereditary qualities of the offspring are transmitted to them directly, through a combination of the qualities of the parents. These qualities, the scientists now tell us, are contained in the parental germ cells. Since Weismann offered his Germ Plasm Theory of Heredity (1883), the scientific world has generally

accepted the doctrine that there are two kinds of cells in the human body,—body cells and germ cells. The body cells die, but the germ cells are immortal because, by means of them, life is transferred from the parent to the offspring. The male germ cell (spermatozoa) uniting with the female germ cell (ovum) creates a new organism which will contain a combination of the characteristics of both of its parents. Each parent contributes an equal number of qualities through the chromosomes (which are located within the germ cell), but these chromosomes may pair off in many different ways, creating different characteristics in children of the same parents. On the whole, however, parents with good qualities will transmit good qualities to their children. The kind of qualities possessed by the parents, therefore, determines, in the long run, the kind of qualities which will be possessed by the children.[1]

Since the most important factor, from an hereditary standpoint, in the determination of qualities of children is the mating of the parents, the force which determines that mating determines what qualities shall be transmitted.

Women determine, in large measure, the character of their mates, hence they determine in a very real sense what the qualities of the race of the future shall be. If women of high qualities choose men of high

[1] For an excellent presentation of this theory of heredity, in all of its bearings, see "Heredity," J. Arthur Thompson, London, Murray, 1908.

qualities, the offspring will have high qualities; but if they mate haphazardly, there can be no guarantee that the qualities of the future will be a whit superior to those of the present.

Since the germ cell transmits hereditary qualities, and since environmental influences can affect only the body cells, scientists agree generally that acquired characteristics are not transmitted. For thousands of years women of China have bound up their feet without decreasing the foot-size of the race. The foot-binding modifies only the body cells, leaving the germ cells undisturbed. In the same way, a woman who has lost an arm will not bear a one-armed child, any more than a horse, whose tail is cropped, or a dog whose ears have been shorn, will bear offspring with these acquired qualities. One-armed women, tailless horses, and short-eared dogs suffer from a modification of the body cells, but not of the germ cells,—a modification which can leave no trace in the offspring.

But changes do occur in species and races. The female dog is brown,—the puppies are spotted; the mother has brown eyes, the child blue. How can scientists account for these and the thousand other modifications of the parental type which appear in the offspring? There are two forces which adequately determine them,—the first is variation, the second is selection.

Variation, due to different combinations of parental chromosomes, is universal.[1] No six rabbits, born in

[1] *Supra,* Chapter III.

the same litter, are precisely alike. They differ from the mother and from each other, in eye color, markings, size, weight, digestion, speed,—in fact, they vary in nearly every characteristic. From the observation of countless illustrations like this one, the biologist concludes that no animal breeds perfectly true to type.

Nature always produces a surplus. Among all plants and animals, more offspring are brought into the world than can possibly live on the available food supply. Hence an eternal struggle is in progress,—brother against brother, sister, father and mother. The strongest, or fiercest, or cleverest lives, crowding out all of the rest. Since in each family there is variation, there is always a strongest and a weakest; a struggle, and an ultimate survival of the fittest. In this struggle, the final triumph of one or more of the most capable units constitutes selection. The weakest, those least able to withstand the struggle, disappear, while the species is continued by the strong. Thus the unfit are eliminated from each generation, while the fit are selected to be the parents of the new generation.

Selection carried on without human interference is called natural selection. When, however, man takes a hand in the process, directing and dominating it, it is called artificial selection.

Artificial selection may be the result of the action of a superior over an inferior force. Men, for example, may breed a long or short eared dog, by selecting for parents, in each generation, the dogs who have ears nearest to the desired type. On the other hand, every

intelligent society exercises a restraining influence in the selection of its members, deciding by mutual agreement, expressed in public opinion, how the members of the group shall act. Since artificial selection is the force which must be relied upon to secure any improvement in the race, a brief discussion of its operation in the animal and vegetable kingdoms, where alone it has been scientifically employed, may not be amiss.

The cat is related to the fiercest members of the animal kingdom, yet it is gentle, quiet, loves to be caressed and played with, and on the whole, makes a highly desirable domestic pet. What is the cause of this phenomenon? While its powerful jaws and sharp claws remain, the cat is a docile creature, the plaything of children. Nothing else than a long process of selecting the gentlest cats could give such a result. For centuries, none but gentle cats have been allowed to live. If a cat displayed savage qualities, it was promptly dispatched, so that, in each generation of cats, the fierce were destroyed and the gentle were perpetuated. Why were such steps taken? Simply because men wanted a domestic pet that was kindly and quiet.

The cat family in the wilds of India depends for its life and livelihood upon ferocity, hence the ferocious tiger survives, while the less ferocious one is easily killed by its enemies, or starves to death because it can secure no food. A rigorous process of natural selection destroys the gentle tiger and perpetuates the fierce one.

Natural selection is unconscious,—that is, it occurs without the intervention of any superior will, but it occurs none the less surely. A good sized codfish annually lays from thirty to fifty millions of eggs, only two or three of which ever develop into mature codfish. The rest are destroyed before or after hatching by the cod's enemies. In the course of years, this "survival of the fittest" produces a creature perfectly adapted to the environment in which he lives.

While natural selection is unconscious, occurring in the course of a struggle for existence, artificial selection is conscious. Men decide to have tame cats, and in order to secure them, they destroy all wild ones. This deliberate selection has remade or domesticated animals.

Modern agriculture depends upon artificial selection for the production of new species. Consider, for example, the work of the stock breeder. A wild hog runs along the mountain side, living on nuts and roots. His back is sharp, his legs are long and sinewy, while his body is short, bony and scrawny. This is not the type of animal that the pork market demands. Hogs must be long bodied, small boned and fat. Hence the hog breeder attempts to modify the "razor back" to suit the demand of the market. In the course of a few generations, by selecting the short legged, fat, quiet hogs to be the parents of the next generation, a type of animal is produced which answers every requirement. The body is round and sleek, the legs are short, and the bones small. When this hog is killed

and dressed, the greater portion of the carcass is edible. The breeding of cattle, sheep, chickens, and other domestic animals has been carried forward along similar lines.

The most remarkable artificial selective work of the past few years has involved the development of vegetable rather than of animal species. The thornless cactus, and the Burbank potato, are well known illustrations of achievements in this field. The plant breeders of the latter Nineteenth Century have literally revolutionized plant life. Consider, for example, the work of the government experiment stations in developing cereal and other crops with a capacity to resist disease. The gravest foes of the farmer during late years have been blights, scales, and other diseases which attacked, and often completely destroyed, all varieties of crops, from wheat to apple trees. Spraying, which was resorted to, proved in some cases, a valuable preventive, but at once the question arose,—"Why not produce a species of wheat which will not get blight?" So the breeders set to work. Men were sent all over the world to look for kinds of wheat which would resist blight, and experiment after experiment was made to secure a variety of grain that would prove immune to the dreaded disease.

Coincident with these experiments, settlements were being made on the dry lands of the West, where the rainfall (12 to 15 inches a year) is only a third of that of the Atlantic Coastal plain. Here was a new problem. The land was fertile, but the water was scarce.

A wheat must be bred which had the power to resist drought. Eventually, by careful selection, a variety of wheat was produced which was comparatively free from blight, and which required very little moisture.

Through artificial selection the hand of man has transformed the vegetable world. The luscious Baldwin is the descendant of the thorn apple; the splendid market tomato was grown from a weed; cereal grains are produced with qualities wholly unlike those which naturally belong to them. Men have revolutionized agriculture through selective breeding, creating new qualities by selecting for parents those individuals which came the nearest to possessing the desirable attributes.

"But," you protest, "we knew all of this before." Perhaps. But have you ever pondered over the application of this doctrine? If men would but see the universal application of selection, and after studying the question in all of its bearings, would set themselves to perfect the human race as successfully as they have perfected certain species in the animal and vegetable kingdom, the same principles that have revolutionized the vegetable and animal world might well revolutionize human society. Men and women could easily employ stronger and more vigorous bodies; they could utilize added funds of energy; they might develop higher aesthetic qualities. The need for improving the heredity of the human race, whether by selection, or by some other means yet undiscovered, is emphasized on every hand by aenemic, weakly, mis-

shapen bodies, and deficient minds. Men and women lack energy, vision, mental grasp, inspiration. They are not the "best in stock."

Selection will have no effect upon acquired characteristics, since they are not inherited, but it will determine the combination of parental traits which are to be handed down to the next generation. Do men wish a speedy horse? They do not attempt to breed it from cart-horses. Does a breeder aim to secure large red apples? He breeds from the best, and not the worst strains. So, in human society, there are many and varying qualities. From feeble-mindedness to genius, men and women vary, because of the varying characteristics of their parents.

All hereditary qualities, whether they be good or bad, are transmitted from parent to offspring; hence, if it be the aim of society to produce strong bodies, alert minds and noble characters, it behooves society to see that men and women with such qualities are the fathers and mothers of the future.

Too much emphasis cannot be laid on the necessity of suppressing the undesirable, and encouraging and perpetuating the desirable qualities in each generation.

The limited study of the transmission of human ability, and a wide experience with the transmission of ability in animals, leads to the inference that ability among men may be consciously handed on from generation to generation. As the transmission of special ability through the germ cell has not been established, beyond the possibility of cavil, we need not insist upon

it here. Whether ability is the result of a careful training during infancy and early youth, or of wise selection through marriage, is unimportant to this discussion, since in either case the responsibility for the transmission rests upon parenthood.

The pioneer work in establishing the transmission of special capacity from parent to child was done by Francis Galton, who estimated that the men who "have distinguished themselves pretty frequently either by purely original work or as a leader of opinion," *i.e.* the geniuses,—constitute 250 (.025%) in every million men. The transmission of special capacity was illustrated by an intensive study of the judges of England from 1660 to 1865. On this study, Galton bases his estimate that the most gifted members of distinguished judges' families had 26% of genius among their fathers and 36% of genius among their sons. Thus, in the population at large 250 men in each million are geniuses, while of the fathers of the most distinguished judges, 260,000 in a million, and of the sons 360,000 in a million were eminent. So that the son of a distinguished judge is fifteen hundred times as liable to be eminent as is the son of an average man.[1]

Numerous other illustrations of the transmission of ability are available. An investigation of the genealogies of 65 eminent men of science shows that 26% of their fathers and 60% of their sons were eminent. That is a proportion among the sons of 6 in 10 as con-

[1] "Hereditary Genius," Francis Galton, London, The Macmillan Co., 1892 (First Edition 1869), pp. 6-9 and 74.

trasted with 6 in 25,000 for England at large.[1] In one family,—the Darwins, beginning with Erasmus Darwin (1731-1802), there have been in five generations, sixteen men of scientific attainments.[2] The Bach family of musicians furnishes another remarkable instance of the transmission of ability. In eight generations (1650-1800) there were "far more than twenty eminent musicians," and the biographical collections of musicians gives the lives of fifty-seven. Tradition holds that the men married within the Musical Guild, hence both parents may have been musical. "It was a custom of the family to meet in yearly reunions at which the entertainments were purely musical."[3]

Ability may be the product of heredity, or of early training, but it is certainly transmitted from parent to child. Heredity and environment, combined in parentage, are therefore responsible for it.

The same law holds with equal, if not greater, force in the transmission of defect. While it cannot be shown that ability is due to heredity alone, it has been definitely proven that certain defects are transmitted through the germ cell, and are, therefore, truly hereditary. Feeblemindedness, for example, is generally accepted as an hereditary defect. A recent New York study of families, in which both parents were feebleminded, showed only two normal children in a total of

[1] *Supra*, p. 188.

[2] "The Family and the Nation," W. C. D. and C. D. Whitham, Longmans, London, 1909, pp. 89-90.

[3] "Hereditary Genius," Francis Galton, London, The Macmillan Co., 1892, p. 233.

seventy-five. In one Pennsylvania family with feeble-minded parents, there are eleven children, all feeble-minded. All of the more recent studies of institutional records show that feeble-mindedness may usually be traced through several generations.

Other forms of defect than those due to mental disorders, as, for example, delinquency and social dependence, are handed down from generation to generation. Among several instances of the transmission of delinquency none is more striking than that of a notorious Indiana family ("The Tribe of Ishmael"). In one branch of the family "there were originally four children who raised pauper families. One son of the third generation died in the penitentiary; his two sons in the fourth generation have been in the penitentiary; a daughter in the fourth generation was a prostitute with two illegitimate children. Another son of the third generation has a penitentiary record, and died of delirium tremens—There have been several murders; a continuous pauper and criminal record. . . ."[1]

No more terrible social scourge is conceivable than the constant reproduction of incapacity, pauperism, crime and vice. No social contrast could be more full of meaning than that between the Jukes family and the Jonathan Edwards family. On one side defect and social cost, on the other ability and civic worth have been handed down for generations.[2]

[1] "The Tribe of Ishmael," Oscar C. McCulloch, Proceedings National Conf. of C. and C., 1888.

[2] "Jukes-Edwards," A. E. Winship, Harrisburg, R. L. Myers & Co., 1900, Chapter VIII.

MAX "JUKE" (born 1720)	JONATHAN EDWARDS (born 1703)
1200 descendants identified	*1394 descendants identified*
300 in the poorhouse	295 college graduates
2300 years in all	12 college presidents
300 died in childhood	65 college professors
440 viciously diseased	60 physicians
400 physical wrecks	100 clergymen and musicians
50 notorious prostitutes	75 army and navy officers
7 murderers	60 prominent authors
60 habitual thieves averaged 12 years in jail	100 lawyers
	30 judges
130 convicted of crime	80 held public office
"None of them ever contributed to social welfare."	1 vice-president
	3 U. S. Senators
Their actual and potential cost to society was $1,250,000.	"It is not known that any of them was ever convicted of crime."

Thus one family has produced twelve hundred social burdens or social scourges, while the other has given to the race nearly fourteen hundred social servants. These families stand at the two extremes of society. They are as far apart as the East and the West. The first family points to social decay, the second to social progress.

Whether or not ability and defect are the result of heredity through the germ cell or of environment through early training, or of both,—the evidence is very strong in support of the contention that they are both handed down from parent to child. If that be true,—if the hereditary characteristics are the combination of the characteristics of both parents, then the choice in the mating of the parents determines the characteristics of the offspring.

Since the status of a race depends upon the stamina of the individuals composing it, and since the characteristics of each of these individuals are determined by the characteristics of both parents, the force that brings the parents together determines the fate of the race. Who is responsible for selection? Does woman participate in it? Every conventionally modest woman instinctively shrinks from such a thought, yet it may well be that when the time is ripe, she selects her mate just as instinctively as she now shrinks from the idea of selection.

CHAPTER XIX

WOMEN AS SELECTORS

"COME, man, master up your courage and ask her, —of course she'll have you."

Will she? That depends entirely upon the qualities of the candidate, and the ideals and standards of the woman. If the man possesses the qualities for which the woman is searching, she will say, "Yes"; but if he does not, she will say, "No." Upon that "Yes" or "No" depends the mating of this particular man and woman, and the possible transmission of a combination of their qualities to some of the children born into the next generation. It is not only the man's future misery or happiness which hangs on the balance of the woman's choice; but, in addition, the characteristics of the new generation.

Heroes and heroines are not in most matters true to life, but they are true in this—that the man casts his future at the woman's feet, leaving the decision to her. In reality she has probably decided long before, when listening to his confidences, and sympathizing with his misfortunes,—that she would marry him; were this not so, she would hardly have allowed him to propose.

Traditionally man selects. The whole problem of "proposing" is his. From the days when he lay in

wait behind a thicket until the woman of his choice wandered far enough away from her kinsmen for him to stun her by a blow from his club and carry her off to be his servile wife; through the time when a man bought a woman from her father for a sum of money, a dukedom or some other such consideration, that tradition of masculine selection has survived. Meantime, however, women have been emancipated. The Nineteenth Century—"Woman's Century"—witnessed a revolution in woman's status, which made her industrially, legally, morally and socially free to choose. Among other choices she has the alternative choice of her future husband.

To paraphrase, in all seriousness, a well-known saying,—"Man proposes; woman disposes." The male is no longer the sole selective agent,—he merely makes an offer which may or may not be accepted by the woman. Men have the initial, women have final choice, and it is upon that final choice that the new generation depends.

This thought of woman's selective power is not new, but it is somewhat unconventional. It, therefore, occasions, just at first, a sharp reaction.

"Impossible," exclaims the modest girl, "who ever heard of a woman's proposing, even in leap-year?"

Men assume an even more contemptuous attitude. "I expect to select *my* wife," remarks the college senior pompously, "and she won't be one of these new women, either."

Yet this man will make the acquaintance of a girl,

and join the ranks of her admirers. One day, he will awaken to the fact that he is in love, and after going through the necessary preliminaries of doubt, hesitancy and resolution, he will propose. In his heart he will believe to the end of his days, that he picked out his wife,—that he married her. The very idea of his having been married by her is repugnant to his sense of masculine dignity. What really happened? There were twenty suitors ranged before this girl's eyes. Among the twenty, this man appealed to her most, and either intentionally or instinctively, the girl made every effort to attract his attention and win his favor. She selected him out of the group who came to her house. When he proposed, therefore, even if she said, "Oh this is so sudden!" what she really meant was, "Well, at last you've done it, but you certainly were slow."

There is a girl in an eastern city who illustrates the point excellently. She has a dozen warm admirers, but is indifferent to all of them. Among the recent additions to her "kindergarten" as she calls it, was a splendid young fellow of the highest type. A week later, the young lady, discussing the matter with a friend, exclaimed, triumphantly,—"I believe he's the one." If he proves on further acquaintance to be "the one," the young lady will marry him; whereupon the lucky one will spend his remaining years in congratulating himself on having an excellent taste in selecting a wife, backed by an ability to secure what he decided upon.

Of the women who marry, probably eight out of ten

have either refused a proposal or else have so discouraged one or more men as to prevent them from proposing. In either case, the woman held the final choice, deciding who should or who should not be her mate.

Men have always overemphasized their part in the progress of the world making. An appeal to ethnology, botany, and zoölogy shows conclusively that among the lower forms of life not only is there no male, but the female is a self-fertilizing, self-perpetuating being. Then, through the process of selection, a male is developed for the purpose of more complete fertilization. The male is small, inoffensive, helpless. One little female creature carries two males, one in a pocket on each side of her body, to insure fertilization at the right time. Among certain spiders, the female is so strong and fierce that the male who approaches her is almost always devoured, either before or after fertilization is completed, so that he really gives his life to perpetuate his race.

Throughout the world of lower organisms, the female is larger and stronger,—the male seems to be an after thought of nature, a better scheme than self-fertilization for the perpetuation of the species.[1]

Among the higher animals the female selects, from among the males who contend for her favor, the strongest or the most decorated. Standing, as she does, at

[1] For an able discussion of the biologic importance of the female, see "Pure Sociology," Lester F. Ward, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1903, Chapter XIV.

the center of racial life and progress, "the balance wheel of the whole (evolutionary) machinery," the female, through her choice, regulates the future of the race by choosing among the numerous males the strongest or most successful as the parent of her offspring. "While the voice of nature, speaking to the male in the form of an intense appetitive interest, says to him: fecundate! it gives to the female a different command and says: discriminate! . . . Here the value of a plurality of males is apparent. In such a plurality there are always differences. The female recognizes the differences and instinctively selects the male that has the highest value for the race."[1]

Briefly, then, throughout the biologic world, the male is either absent altogether, an incidental creature, or, in the higher forms of life, one of several, among whom the female selects.

The biologic world is a female world. The males are largest and strongest only among a few of the higher animals, while it is among human beings alone that the male subjugates the female. We are here reviewing, not an evolution, but a revolution in the relative positions of the sexes. The history of this revolution, stated in its shortest terms, is as follows:

The female, as selector, decided between the males, who, sexually active, sought out the female. A contest at once arose among each group of males for the favor of the female or females in question. "Jealousy, the 'green-eyed monster which doth mock the meat it

[1] *Supra*, p. 325.

feeds on,' here showed its usefulness, for it coöperated with the aesthetic faculty of the female and led to all those intense activities of the rival males that developed the characters that the females preferred. Success in these struggles for favor, due in turn to the qualities that insured success, was the sure passport to favor, and female favor meant parenthood of the race."[1]

In each generation, the females were selecting for parenthood the largest, strongest, bravest, handsomest males, a process which ultimately developed these qualities in the male, until, in the course of ages, size, strength, courage and beauty came to be looked upon as male qualities. The male became, through the process of selection, larger, stronger, and often more beautifully decorated than the female; but it was the female who, through her selective power, had caused this transformation. "This," writes Ward, "is why I reject the usual expression 'male superiority' for those relatively few cases in which the male has acquired superior size and strength along with the various ornaments with which the female has decked him out."[2]

However, even in the higher forms of life, where the female is "greatly surpassed in size and strength by the male," the males never use their strength "to coerce the females into submission."[3] With dawning intelligence comes to man the concept, "Here is a weaker creature than I am. I can force her to do my

[1] *Supra*, p. 328. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 330. [3] *Idem.*

work and to gratify my appetites." Then, for the first time in the history of biologic evolution, the female is subjected to the male.

The infusion of one other element completes the cycle of evolution from the dominance and selective power of the female, through her subjugation to the male, to her dawning democratic status, in which she and the male will exercise equal selective power,—I refer to the development of sympathy. Probably coming earliest in the female, sympathy is a virtue of comparatively recent origin. Among many barbaric tribes it seems to be entirely lacking, while it is only in the most highly civilized society that the concept of sympathy reaches an advanced form. When, however, it does dawn upon the male that his female companion is burdened to the point of intense suffering, he begins to alleviate her most acute trials,—taking upon himself some of the burden of maintaining society. Among the highly civilized races, this sympathy overreaches itself, and results in depriving women of all occupations, converting them into parasites, dependent for support upon the efforts of the male.

Selection was at one time the function of the female. The dawning intelligence in man led him to subjugate woman and become himself the selector. Now, again the hand of time moves forward and woman assumes a large share of selective power. What does the future hold? Will women grow more or less powerful as selective agents?

The answer practically hinges on the question of

sexual attraction which exercises far greater influence over men than over women. As among animals, so among men, woman remains sexually passive, and is sought out by the male, who is sexually active. In this fact lies the explanation of the selective power of the female among animals and of the selective power of women among men.

Sexual attraction, a purely animal force, necessarily acts most strongly upon the most strongly sexed group (the men) making them the seekers and leaving women to exercise their choice among the men who seek them. Were no other explanation available, this one is sufficient to justify the statements that while traditionally men are the selectors, in reality, as soon as women are freed from slavery, and permitted to exercise free choice, they, even more than the men, determine mating. They have not, certainly, a universal or even an initial choice,—they cannot select among all of the men in a city or a state. But among their acquaintances, they unquestionably have selective choice.

To the power of sexual attraction, which is natural and basic, woman adds a purely artificial force in the form of adornment and coquetry which is none the less effective in securing a wider range of selective choice. By these artificial means, of which the fashions are a very lame, inartistic expression, women seek to gather around them a larger number of males than would ordinarily be drawn by sexual attraction. To be sure, adornment and coquetry are both grossly

misused, but aside from this misuse, they serve as valuable aids in increasing the sphere of woman's selective choice.

With the education of men and of women, with the rising standards of character and culture, both sexes are demanding high standards of manhood and womanhood. Some men, with whom sexual attraction is not a dominating factor, look deeper than beauty, demanding noble qualities, as well as good appearances. Men are fast learning to distinguish between the external and the real woman. As Stevenson has pointed out in "Virginibus Puerisque," "When a young lady has angelic features, eats nothing to speak of, plays all day long on the piano, and sings ravishingly in church, it requires a rough infidelity, falsely called cynicism, to believe that she may be a little devil after all. Yet so it is; she may be a tale-bearer, a liar and a thief; she may have a taste for brandy and no heart." Whether cynicism or no, many men have developed that "rough infidelity" of which Stevenson writes.

For the men who are looking deeper than surface indications, women must be worthy in the true sense of the word. They must be individualized, and boast some positive attainments.

This rising standard is true in the case of men, but it is even truer in the case of women. The traditional woman married in order to be married. The high school and college trained girl of today marries to secure a good mate. The traditional woman was

forced to marry, either from the necessity of relieving her father of the burden of her support, or of escaping the disgrace of single blessedness. The educated girl of today goes to work, when her education is finished, and waits until a man appears who is really worthy of her. If he never appears, she remains single. Women are setting a standard for men, socially, intellectually, morally; and the men who fall below that standard must be content with the less worthy women.

Selection, through parenthood, determines the characteristics which will be possessed by the new generation. Within certain limits, women are the selectors, and in so far as this relation holds, they determine the heredity of the race. Women therefore hold in their hands the opportunity to interpret selective mating and parenthood in terms of race culture and progress. While each woman's field of selection is limited, within that field lies a great opportunity for service. Should women maintain their present standards of worth, and continue to demand the same standards of men; should they use their selective power to bring together the noblest and best in each generation; then they may decide to transmit to the future the noblest and best of the present age.

CHAPTER XX

WOMEN AS SPENDERS

"THE purse-strings of the American people are held by the women," runs a new saying,—a saying fraught with consequences of far reaching importance in the evolution of American life. Within a century, women have evolved from producers into spenders.

As producers, women assisted in creating economic goods; as spenders, women determine what economic goods shall be created. The American women are the spenders of the nation. "Why do you look so hard at your pay envelope?" asked the paymaster of the mechanic. "Because, sir," was the rejoinder, "'tis only two looks at it that I get. One when ye put it into my hands, and one when I put it into the hands of the ould lady at home." This philosophy expresses the situation of the American people. Among the poor, particularly, but likewise, to a marked extent among the middle classes, women direct the expenditures for consumption goods. Hence Mrs. Richard's statement: "The emergence of women from the sphere of production into that of consumption of wealth has brought with it a disturbance of the economic conditions of the Anglo-Saxon world."[1] In reality the disturbances in

[1] "The Woman Who Spends," Bertha J. Richardson. Boston, Whitcomb & Barrows, 1910, Introduction by Ellen H. Richards.

the economic world caused the revolution in the functions of women, but the statement is none the less important. Since the industrial revolution women have become functionaries in an essentially new field, —the field of spending.

"Years ago, when our nation was a nation of country folk, women did little of the spending, but helped much in the production of wealth."[1] In those days little money was spent because the home was self-sufficient, producing most of the economic goods which were required to sustain life and consuming most of the economic goods which it produced. The advent of the factory system with its increased amount and variety of goods, opened a new field,—the field of spending.

Wages, under the new system, were no longer paid in kind or in "bed and board," but in money, which must be exchanged for economic goods. In the rural districts, the family had its own truck patch, pig pen, cow, and chicken coop; but the same family, moving into a great city, must purchase every article which it consumed. Meanwhile, the variety of goods increased; advertising developed on a gigantic scale in every field. Many kinds of goods appeared, so that the spender must choose between them. Farmers' wives in remote districts still exchange a few dozen eggs for the groceries and dry goods which they need; but the city woman is overwhelmed with an avalanche of opportunities to spend. She lives in the midst of an

[1] *Supra*, p. 35.

advertising, spending world,—in a maze of newspapers, billboards, trolley-cars, store windows,—all demanding their share of attention. The man is at work in the factory or store. The woman is at home—spending. Thus spending becomes a business,—an art. "Shopping" is classed among the professions. To shop well, to know values and qualities, requires an education which the city woman acquires at an early age.

The bargain hunter has become a joke. Wild eyed, rude, careless of others' rights or comforts, she pushes her way into the front rank of buyers, making her presence felt by her sharp elbows and her wishes by her shrill voice. We ridicule the bargain hunter, but she is the advance agent of progress. Extreme though she is in her attitude and actions, nevertheless she typifies the Woman Who Spends. She is knowing, alert, and she gets what she wants. She is the radical in a new movement for the efficient spending of income. Let no one despise the bargain hunter. Every movement has its radicals, the development of spending is no exception to the rule.

Expenditures for production goods and for consumption goods must be sharply distinguished. Men spend for production goods,—they buy wagons, factories, machines, railroad ties, shovels, and steel bridges. Women, on the other hand, buy consumption goods,—hats, meat, flour, shoes, lace, tea, bread and soap. The two classes of goods are wholly distinct, but intimately related.

Why do men spend (invest) their money in produc-

tion goods? Because they hope to assist, directly or indirectly, in the making of consumption goods. Wagons are bought to be used in delivering purchases; factories and machines produce flour, shoes and lace; railroads transport grain from the fields to the cities, —all of man's work consists either in making consumption goods or in making tools which will make or assist in making consumption goods. In short, the object of production is consumption. Since women have a choice in the purchase of consumption goods, they practically determine what kind of goods men shall produce. The woman who selects washing powder in preference to soap, increases the demand for washing powder, thus making it probable that washing powder and not soap will be manufactured. If all of the women in the country should unite in the determination to use only washing powder, soap manufacturers would stop business.

Since the spender holds the balance of industrial power, a union of all spenders could arbitrarily dictate to all producers, determining the character and extent of their production, deciding on quality, and, within certain limits, on price. The spender is the arbiter of modern industrial society.

Women are the spenders for consumption goods; all industrial effort is aimed directly or indirectly at the production of consumption goods; therefore the spenders, women, hold in their hands the power to control production.

Women may not understand the problem. They

may fail to assert independence, choosing in response to clever advertising rather than to the inherent quality or worth of the goods; they may buy tawdry lace and cheap jewelry; yet by that very act, they are determining production. Failing to realize their power over industry, they prostitute their influence to their whims or fancies, instead of ruling their purchases by judgment.

As women are educated in spending, as they grow in power to discriminate, they will determine production to a greater and greater degree. Nothing in the world is so sensitive as "business." At the least indication of a change in popular favor, "business" will change its attitude to meet public demands. As women, through their buying, express public demands, business takes its cue from women.

Here, then, is a great field of opportunity for choice. Again American women must choose. They must choose between weak subservience to the influence of advertising, and a matured, trained judgment; they must choose between allowing the manufacturers to decide for them and deciding for the manufacturers. If they choose selfishly, they will take what comes on the market, careless, so long as they receive what they call "full value," indifferent to the conditions of manufacture and to the inherent value of the product.

On the other hand, the women may choose socially. Educated to a true sense of their responsibility, organized into powerful groups, these consumers may make and enforce demands. Acting on lines similar to

these followed by the various "Consumers' Leagues," they may refuse goods which have been produced under bad conditions,—sweat shop goods; goods made in unsanitary factories by overworked operatives; goods made by child labor; goods which are the product of any industrial condition that is unfair or unjust to the workers in that particular industry. Following out the same policy, they may demand goods with the Union Label, ordinarily a guarantee of just working conditions. In short, by their organizations, the consumers may enforce decent treatment for the producers.

The spenders, the determinants of consumption, are women. Upon their shoulders devolves this new duty of controlling production through wise spending.

Women, therefore, must first be educated to wisdom in spending; second, they must realize their responsibility as spenders; and lastly, they must organize effectively. Coöperative effort is the only effective form of effort in modern society. The question then stands,—Will women measure up to their responsibility? Will this new generation of women coöperate to enforce the rights of the consumer? Their action will be their answer.

CHAPTER XXI

DOMESTIC SCIENCE

SPENDING is the means of which domestic science is the end. Spending provides the housewife with the raw materials out of which domestic science produces the finished product. Whether the woman spends five or fifty dollars a week, this relation,—spending, the means; domestic science, the end,—remains the same.

The term "domestic science" is really a misnomer. "Domestic" it is, but "science" it is not. Science is defined as:—"Knowledge gained and verified by exact observation and correct thinking." In the light of such a definition, the activities usually described as "Domestic Science" become, in reality, "Domestic hit or miss."

"Domestic Science" is not a science, because the body of knowledge upon which domestic activities are based has never until very recent years been the result of any exact measurement. Consider, for example, the baking of bread. There is a tradition that bread of lightness and flavor such as mother used to make has vanished with the past generation. What are the facts concerning this fabulous bread? In the first place, we ate it when we were ravenously hungry girls and boys. Pine shavings, sufficiently disguised, would

have passed muster in those days of hearty appetite. Secondly, for every woman who could bake bread, there were at least three who could not. If you had the good fortune to be born in the home of an expert breadmaker, you ate good bread, but the mathematical probabilities were three to one against you. In the last analysis, the bread that mother used to make, like the winters that father used to see, was the exception and not the rule. Most bread was heavy, soggy, and sour, because it was made by untrained cooks. Faulty tradition, rather than exact knowledge furnished the basis for its manufacture.

The baking of bread furnishes one illustration of the existing situation. The body of domestic knowledge is the merest guess work. In like manner, "correct thinking" seldom dominates the pursuit of the domestic arts. An abundance of food fried in fat is placed upon the table,—meat, potatoes, tomatoes, and numerous other vegetables are frequently prepared in this indigestible form. Indigestible? Certainly. In the process of frying, the food particles are encased in a coat of fat, which prevents the saliva and other digestive juices from acting properly upon them while they are passing through the mouth and other parts of the digestive tract. This is but one instance of the light thrown by the chemical and dietetic researches of the past ten years upon the unscientific character of "Domestic Science."

Domestic activities are, however, of the most fundamental importance. The person who assumes the

responsibility for the management of a household assumes the direction of the social unit, which is still the center of American life.

The responsibilities of the house manager may, for convenience of discussion, be grouped under four headings:

1. The purchase and preparation of food.
2. The provision of clothing and shelter.
3. The care of children.
4. The creation of a home atmosphere.

The income which purchases these necessaries is, in most cases, provided by the men of the family, but the responsibility for the distribution of the income over the various items of expenditure rests upon the women.

Looked at from the physical side alone, the most important single function of the home is the provision of food. Hence the work of domestic science must center primarily around that problem. "Oh," says the girl, "I can cook." Of course you can, anyone with a groundwork of common sense and a smattering of experience can cook, but cooking is only one element and really, a small element, in the provision of food for a household. Cooking is to food what varnish is to a table,—the finishing touch. Before a table can be varnished, it must be built; before a meal can be cooked, it must be planned and bought. The real problem, in the provision of a diet, is not cooking at all, but food combination.

The woman who is to provide wisely the food for a household must understand,—

1. The elements of diet.
2. Food properties and values.
3. The combination of food values.
4. The preparation of food-stuffs.

Food chemistry, nutrition values and food combination all precede the cooking, in time and, from one standpoint, in importance.

There are three principal nutritive elements in food, —Protein, Fats and Carbohydrates. Protein is furnished chiefly by meats, eggs, dairy products, cereals; Fats by meats and dairy products; and Carbohydrates (starches and sugars) by cereals, vegetables, and sugar. Upon these three elements men depend for energy, heat and body-building material.

The amount of each of these food elements needed daily by an adult man doing moderately hard physical work, has been estimated as

118 grains of Protein
56 " " Fat
500 " " Carbohydrates

Such amounts will, according to Voit, provide 3055 calories of energy.[1]

While these quantities suffice for an adult man the

[1] "Daily Meals of School Children," Caroline L. Hunt, Washington, 1909, Government Printing Office, p. 29.

proportion of each which is needed to maintain efficiency varies. Up to the twenty-seventh year, there is need for a very high amount of carbohydrates; the maximum of proteins is needed at twenty-two, while the maximum of fats is needed from thirty to forty.[1] As the relative proportions of the elements differ at different ages, it is necessary, in providing an adequate diet, to know the relation between age and food value. Variations in diet must also be made for sex, for the character of work which the individual is performing, for the time of the year, and for the climate. The provision of diet is thus technically, a very involved matter.

The attempts finally to establish true concepts of diet values have given rise to a storm of discussion. On the one hand are ranged the scientists who insist upon a high protein diet, maintaining that protein, particularly as found in meat, is fundamentally necessary to the human system.[2] On the other hand is ranged the school led by Professor Chittenden of Yale, who insists that a low protein diet and a high carbohydrate diet is better for the human system than the high protein diet.

While the doctors are settling their disagreements, the housewife must prepare supper. To do this efficiently and cheaply, she must know what food

[1] *Supra*, p. 33.

[2] "The Expansion of Races," C. E. Woodruff, New York, Rebman, 1909, contains an excellent discussion of the Nitrogen Problem. Major Woodruff holds a strong brief for nitrogen (Protein).

values are contained in specific foods as well as the relative cost of protein, fat and carbohydrates in the various food products. The following table contains a brief list of a few well known foods, together with a statement of the various nutritive values of each.[1]

	Refuse	Water	Protein	Fat	Carbo-hydrates	Ash	Fuel Value Per Pound (in calories)
Almonds....	45.0	2.7	11.5	30.2	9.5	1.1	1,515
Bananas	35.0	48.9	.8	.4	14.3	.6	260
Butter.....	.....	11.0	1.0	85.0	.....	3.0	3,410
Chocolate...	.....	5.9	12.9	48.7	30.3	3.2	2,625
CreamCheese	.....	34.2	25.9	33.7	2.4	3.8	1,885
Dried Beans.	.....	12.6	22.5	1.8	59.6	3.5	1,520
Hen's Eggs.	11.2	65.5	13.1	9.3	.....	0.9	635
Porterhouse Steak.....	12.7	52.4	19.1	17.9	.....	0.8	1,100
Potatoes.....	20.0	62.6	1.8	0.1	14.7	0.8	295
Sugar.....	.....	.....	.....	....	100.0	.....	1,750
White Bread	.....	35.3	9.2	1.3	53.1	1.1	1,200

Each element contributes in a markedly different degree to diet. Meat and cream cheese are rich in protein and fat; butter contains almost nothing else; white bread and almonds supply carbohydrates; sugar is pure carbohydrate; potatoes furnish only 260 calories of energy per pound, as against 3410 calories for a pound of butter. There is no problem more fascinating for the uninitiated than that presented by a day's food supply, a table of food values, and a series of

[1] "Principles of Nutrition and Nutritive Value of Food," W. O. Atwater, Ph.D. Washington, Government Printing Office, 1910. (Farmers Bulletin No. 142), pp. 16-18.

mathematical calculations, giving, as a final result, the food value of the diet.

The modern grocery and provision store furnishes a wide range for selection, so that the woman who is buying must consider the cost of various articles as well as their nutritive value. Asparagus is always an expensive article of diet, and beans are always cheap, because the food value of asparagus at its usual price as compared with beans at their usual price is very low. On the other hand, as between beans and potatoes the price may be a determining factor. In order to assist the housewife in buying economically, Atwater presents a very interesting table, showing what amount of food value may be secured for ten cents. The ten cents will buy in:—[1]

Sirloin beef	410 calories of energy
Butter	1700 calories of energy
Eggs	500 calories of energy
Cheese	1185 calories of energy
Wheat Bread	2000 calories of energy
Oatmeal	4500 calories of energy
Dried beans	3000 calories of energy
Potatoes	3000 calories of energy
Strawberries (in season)	215 calories of energy
Sugar	3000 calories of energy

Such a knowledge of the relation between food values and prices as may be easily secured from available sources will therefore enable the housewife to greatly cheapen the diet, maintaining it, at the same time, on an efficiency basis. Meat is always expensive,

[1] *Supra*, p. 40.

particularly the finer cuts. Cereals and dairy products, on the other hand, usually furnish a high return for a given expenditure. In the same way, all of the different elements in a diet may be examined and compared to determine their relative value.

Here, in brief, is the problem of food values and a statement of a few of the basic facts in dietetics. There is no more vital unsolved problem in domestic science. The problem has been of necessity hinted at, rather than discussed, yet these few hints should provide a very fair basis for judgment of the importance of scientific domestic economy.

The elements in diet studied, food values mastered, and an accurate idea of food combination secured, the home manager is now ready for the cooking. Here, again, the problem is by no means simple. Cooking may be delicious, but very indigestible. A failure to recognize the truth of this fact has made of the Americans a dyspeptic nation. Good food, well cooked, is essential to digestion and nutrition.

While food may be the most important, it is by no means the only problem in domestic science. There are other phases of domestic economy which loom large in the lives of home-makers. There must be a shelter,—a house,—well kept, artistic, efficient. Clothes, too, form an essential element in domestic science. While the problem of clothing boys has been well solved, the girls' clothing still perplexes the thinking woman. The careless, indifferent mothers, who are willing to lace their daughters' bodies into

steel framework in order to make them fashionable, are happy, even if they are destroying health and vitality; but the conscientious mother who wishes to spare her daughter's body from the brutal demands of fashion and at the same time spare her from the stigma of being dowdy, is placed in a trying position.

The care of children forms a no less essential element in domestic science. Feeding, clothing, washing and dressing the child is a world in itself. An abundance of books and magazines present this literature in a readable form, for the consideration of the thinking woman.

All of these tasks,—feeding, sheltering, clothing,—are but the machinery of domestic science. Though they are essential, though the lives and activities of the members of the family are intimately dependent upon them, nevertheless they constitute only the beginning of a successful household. The final question which confronts the housekeeper transcends all of these, because it is more fundamental and far-reaching than they. How shall the homekeeper create a home atmosphere? The food, the clothing and the shelter can be provided elsewhere,—only in the home can the atmosphere of love exist.

Confidence, sympathy, mutual helpfulness,—the spirit of a group, held together by the strongest ties of respect and affection,—these things constitute, ultimately, the true goal of the home maker. The woman presides over the home: in its conduct her word is law. The evolution of factory production which has de-

prived the home of most of its industrial activities has left untouched this one great function,—that of providing an atmosphere of inspiring hope which shall send the members of the family into the world to do effective work.

As spenders, women may direct production; as home makers, they may provide an atmosphere which will determine the attitude of the family toward life and living. In the former case, they are in a measure responsible for the greatest of modern institutions—industry. In the latter case, they do their work through the most fundamental of all social institutions,—the home.

CHAPTER XXII

DOMESTIC SERVANTS AND MOTHER'S HELPERS

"THE very idea," cried one woman indignantly, "she had the audacity to tell me that she would rather work in the factory than in my kitchen."

Her friend sighed, sympathetically. "Well, Edith, perhaps it is better that you did not get her. I had a girl doing my cooking last winter who actually drove me into a sanitarium. You know I spent six weeks up there this spring, and I do believe that she was the cause."

"They are perfectly terrible, these servant girls," exclaimed a third woman. And so the dialogue went around the circle. There is hardly a group of middle class women whose troubles do not include the "Servant Problem." Can it be that there is any opportunity here for the American woman?

The "Domestic Servant" is an interesting creature. In 1900 there were 1,124,383[1] of her in all parts of the United States. Since the census enumerates more than sixteen million families, this number would provide about one servant to each fourteen families, or allowing for the families which have more than one servant, it would allow servants to somewhat less than

[1] "Statistics of Woman at Work," Bureau of Census, Washington, 1907, p. 40.

seven per cent of the families in the United States. This seven per cent constitutes a portion of the middle and all of the upper income classes. The servant problem is therefore an upper and middle class problem from the standpoint of the mistress. What of the standpoint of the servant?

The American servant is often not an American; she is usually single, and under thirty-five years of age.

The extremes of the problem naturally appear in the cities where the middle and upper classes live. In cities having at least 50,000 inhabitants in 1900,

12.6 per cent of the servants are native born of native parents.

19.2 per cent are native born of foreign parents.

45.3 per cent are foreign born.

22.9 per cent are negroes.[1]

The domestic servant of American cities is therefore in nearly half the cases foreign born, and nearly one-eighth of the cases native born of native white parents. The American born white girl has practically ceased going into domestic industry.

The girls who do enter industry are in 77.4 per cent of the cases under 35 years of age.[2] Here, as in industry generally, it is the young girl, who has not yet had a satisfactory chance to marry, who constitutes the largest percentage of the servant class. Moreover, of these servants, 76.7 per cent are single, while 13 per cent are widowed or divorced.[3] Thus nearly ninety per cent are unmarried.

[1] *Supra*, p. 44. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 48. [3] *Ibid.*, p. 50.

The present day domestic servant is therefore a non-American, young, unmarried woman. It is this young, unmarried woman who has driven our wives and mothers into sanitariums; and then walked contemptuously away without notice. Why is she in arms? What steps can be taken to right this formidable problem of the well-to-do women? There is but one answer. Domestic service must be placed on a par with other gainful occupations. So long as meniality and servility are prerequisites of a "desirable" servant, the best girls will take up some other form of occupation.

The servant problem is another of the outgrowths of modern industry. Half a century ago, girls were unable to work in industrial occupations on any extensive scale. Therefore, domestic service was almost the sole alternative for the untrained woman, seeking a field of employment. Under such circumstances the girl who was unable to marry, took up domestic service. Today she may choose between domestic service and a wide variety of industrial occupations. The girl is no longer forced into service. She may choose, and with her power to choose comes the monopoly power so vital to the enforcement of her demands,—so disastrous to the pocket book and happiness of her employer.

If there were three good servants looking for one position, a good servant could be secured with little or no difficulty, but since there are three positions waiting for one good servant, the servant presents a

problem which looms large on the domestic horizon. Servants are "independent" because they are in demand. They are in demand because industry has afforded women new fields of choices.

"But," exclaims the good lady, "can it be that any sane girl would prefer work in a dirty, noisy factory, to employment in my immaculate kitchen? Why, if I were in her place—"

If you were in her place, Madam, you would do exactly as she does. If you had in your make-up enough womanliness to long for independence and enough skill to succeed at semi-skilled factory work, you would choose the factory instead of the kitchen.

What are you asking of your cook?

1. She must be able to cook a wide variety of dishes—perhaps 75 or 100.

2. She must be neat and clean.

3. She must work from 7 A. M. to 9 P. M. To be sure, she has "time off," but it is scarcely her own time.

4. She must cook dinner Saturday evening, and two or three meals on Sunday.

Suppose that same girl were to secure employment in a factory. What would the superintendent require of her?

1. She must know how to do one thing well.

2. She must be punctual and neat.

3. Her hours are from 7 A. M. to 5 P. M., with a half hour for lunch.

4. She has Saturday afternoon and Sunday for her very own.

Yes, you are demanding that a skilled woman—for cooking is an art which it takes years to master—shall work 85 or 90 hours a week, all week long, and in return receive $5 a week, with bed and board. A girl with an equal amount of skill, working 50 hours a week in a factory, would earn $12 a week and find her own bed and board. To be sure, the average factory girl does not earn anything like $12, but remember that the average factory girl is unskilled.

If you were a girl of sixteen, choosing your vocation, you would not hesitate for a moment between the two propositions which I have outlined. You would go to a trade school and then to a factory, or to a factory direct, and apprentice yourself to some trade.

But this is only one little element in the problem. I have not yet set down the phase of the subject which transcends and clinches the entire argument. The girl in your kitchen is a "servant," a menial, an underling, subject to the dictates of the youngest child in the house. The girl in the factory is a "lady," subject to her forewoman and to no other. Her nights out are her own; her mornings and evenings are her own; she is her own mistress one whole day and a half each week, she is not a "servant."

Democracy and servility will not mix. In a country

where people are "born middle clarss, and, thank Gawd, know enough to stay middle clarss," servility carries with it a certain distinction which is necessarily lost in a democracy.

The position of household servants is thus analyzed by Charlotte P. Gilman: "What is the status of household industry as practised by servants? It is this: The Housewife having become the Lady of the House, and the work still having to be done in the house, others must be induced to do it. In the period from which this custom dates it was a simple matter of elevating, 'the wife or chief wife' to a position of dominance, and leaving the work to be done by the rest of the women. Domestic service, as an industrial status, dates from the period of the polygynous groups, the household with the male head and the group of serving women; from the time when wives were slaves and slaves were wives, indiscriminately. (See domestic relations of Jacob.)

"The genesis of the relation being thus established, it is easy to account for its present peculiar and dominating condition—celibacy. The housemaid is the modern derivative from the slave wife. She may no longer be the sub-wife of the master—but neither may she be another man's wife.

"No married man wishes his wife to serve another man. This household service, being esteemed as a distinctly feminine function, closely involved with maternity, or at very least with woman's devotion, and quite inconsistent with any other marriage; therefore,

we find the labors of the household performed by celibate women of a lower class. Our modern household is but a variation of the primitive group—the man and his serving women still."[1]

Domestic service presents four possibilities.—

1. It may become a profession, performed by a trained group.

2. It may be taken over by a menial class.

3. People may live in apartments.

4. They may have their work done coöperatively.

There seems to be no other solution.

If domestic service is made a profession; if the hours are reasonable, the conditions fair; the pay good; if the meniality is eliminated; then the housewife may expect a group of high class servants, her equals in education and refinement, who will do her work as the bookkeeper does the work for her husband,—as a professional matter. On the other hand, the housekeeper may insist on her "prerogatives." Then she may expect to develop a servile class. In some cities, the negro women have already formed the nucleus of such a group. This class will be inferior to the professional class in every sense of the word, and as figs seldom form on thistles, it will seldom do good, reliable work.

Two plans of coöperative housekeeping present themselves as alternatives to this ugly dilemma. Families may live in apartments, eating in a common dining

[1] "The Home," C. P. Gilman, New York, McClure, Phillips & Co., 1903, pp. 105-106.

room, of food prepared by a highly paid corps of chefs, depending on the servants of the apartments for their service; or they may live in individual houses, and have the cooking, cleaning and heating done on a coöperative basis. Thus far the first of these two plans has been the one generally adopted. Men then supplant women in domestic service, and domestic work becomes a profession for them.

There is one ray of clear, bright light on this dismal horizon,—that is the advent of the mother's helper. She is a girl with a high school education, often a trained kindergartener; she takes care of the children primarily, and sometimes of the home. She is not a servant, but a member of the family,—the equal of the children and the parents. The mother's helper has a distinctive vocation, for which she is prepared, and in which she has a position as definite as that of the girl who runs a typewriter in an office or a loom in a factory.

The near future should see a widespread introduction of this "mother's helper" into American households. Perhaps you may be willing to entrust the management of your household to an uneducated, uncultured woman, but if you respect the future welfare of your children, you dare not entrust them to a person who is not in a position to associate both with you and with them, on a basis of perfect equality. No servant is competent to care for, or watch over your children. If you cannot do all the work yourself, and few mothers can do it adequately, demand a young woman of

ability, trained to the management of children and of household affairs. Such a demand of the mothers, wisely met by the schools, should play a leading rôle in solving the servant problem.

School courses should be developed to produce, on the one hand, well trained cooks, and on the other hand, trained mother's helpers. Both professions are of the utmost importance,—the former to the vitality of the nation,—the latter to its future. Perhaps only one woman in twenty-five can afford a mother's helper. Certainly less than one man in twenty-five has a stenographer. Nevertheless, if stenography can be made a profession paying $7, $8, $10 and $15 a week, the wise rearing of children can be put on a level at least as high as that of running a typewriter and at wages commensurate with the service rendered.

In these two branches of domestic service,—cooking and child caring,—there is a wide range of opportunity for American women. Both trades are skilled, and both can be made of fundamental value to the future of the American people. Only when the domestic servant loses her stigma of servility and becomes an employee able to maintain her self-respect, dignity, and independence, will the trained worker be induced to enter domestic service.

CHAPTER XXIII

CHILD TRAINING IN THE HOME

"WHAT shall I do for the benefit of France?" asked Napoleon of Madame de Staël. "Give us, sire," replied that wise woman, "a generation of mothers." She could have expressed no more patriotic sentiment.

Before assuming the duties of motherhood, the woman selects her mate, thus determining the hereditary characteristics of her children. After marriage, she assumes practically the whole duty of training them, thus controlling their early environment. Nature endowed woman with the functions of selection and of child bearing, giving her, by this means, a large measure of control over the heredity characteristics of her offspring. Society has added to the responsibilities of woman by committing to her hands the duty of child training. Upon her then rests the burden of a large measure of the heredity, and the entire early environment of the new generation.

"I recently spoke to a steel worker," said John Graham Brooks, "who told me that he had never seen his baby's eyes. He was working on the twelve-hour shift,—leaving home before six in the morning, and returning after six at night. When he left home the baby was asleep, and when he returned the child was

again in bed. As he had worked seven days each week for nearly a year, he had never had an opportunity of seeing his baby awake,—he was compelled to take his wife's testimony as to the color of its eyes." The case is extreme, you may say. Yes, the case is extreme, yet it typifies the revolution that modern industry has wrought in the home, taking the father away for long hours each day, and throwing upon the mother the entire responsibility of child training.

It is not only among the working classes that this condition exists. The well-to-do are also subject to it. The average business man or lawyer leaves home immediately after breakfast and does not return until night. During the time when his children are playing and learning, the bread-winner is providing the income which makes play and education possible for his children. Perhaps on Saturday afternoon and on Sundays and holidays, if nothing interferes, this man will see his children,—in some cases he may even talk to them and walk with them, securing their sympathy and entering into their lives. But of the constant, intimate contact which the mother has with her children, the average father enjoys no share.

Thus the transformation of the home, the disappearance of the many occupations which were formerly carried on there, and the removal of the father's employment from a place adjacent to the home to some distant factory or office building, have placed the duty of child training upon the women of the household. Whatever home training a child receives is

therefore training from the mother. Biology made women selectors of mates and bearers of children: Civilization has made them the trainers of children as well.

Therefore, those women who choose motherhood, which is from a racial and social standpoint the most important of all occupations, take into their hands the primary responsibility, hereditary and environmental, of the new generation. They determine the hereditary characteristics: they give the child his earliest impressions of the things of this world.

It is these early impressions that ultimately count. "Give me a child until he is seven, and I will stake my reputation on his future," is no idle boast. Whether we are at birth endowed with intellectual powers, or whether our mind is a blank upon which impressions create our thought and character, the impressions of the early formative years are the impressions which stay with us longest. In the former case, the early modifications which are made in the innate characteristics are fundamental; in the latter case, they are the first impressions. Since it is within the home that these early modifications or first impressions are made, upon the home and the home-keeper (the mother) depends their character and influence.

Here, as elsewhere, exceptions must be made. Those mothers who are compelled to add to the family income by going out to work for eight or ten hours each day cannot exercise a complete maternal influence over their children. So serious is such a loss, to the

mother as well as to the child, that, could the mother have foreseen the necessity for her labor during the infancy of her children, it would have justified her in refusing motherhood. Similarly, those mothers whose social duties lead them to commit the care of their children to servants, fail to fulfill the functions of motherhood. Could society have foreseen such a catastrophe, it would have been more than justified in denying motherhood to such women. Both classes fortunately constitute a minority, leaving the vast majority of American women with sufficient leisure to fulfill intelligently the duties which motherhood implies.

Two factors are combining to make American motherhood continually more efficient. In the first place, the transfer of many of the domestic occupations to the factory has left women with abundant leisure. In the second place, widespread education prepares women to fulfill more fully their vital maternal functions.

The present systems of elementary and high school training, defective and incomplete though they unquestionably are, nevertheless render the women of today infinitely more capable of wisely choosing, and wisely administering, than were the women of a century before. The decreasing infant mortality and the increasing length of childhood, both testify eloquently to the advantages of educated motherhood.

At the present day, the home still holds first place among social institutions,—not only as a matter of sentiment, but as a matter of fact. The American home is the center of American social life.

As the central unit in American society, the home furnishes great possibility for directing the lives of children. In the first place, it can individualize them. In the home, as nowhere else, is the individual discovered and developed, the home comes the nearest to fulfilling Rousseau's ideal system of education,—one teacher and one pupil,—for in the home the mother is teacher, and in American society her pupils seldom exceed five in number. The average child outside of the home,—whether in school or factory,—is submerged in a crowd, and unless properly cared for, may lose his identity as an individual, but in the home, each individual counts, each child has full opportunity for the exercise of his faculties along personal lines. The home, the smallest and most exclusive school in civilization, may give to a child education and training ten fold more valuable than that which he will receive in his later scholastic life.

The goal of home training, expressed in its simplest terms, is the moulding of character. Successful character moulding pre-supposes five things.

1. Individualization.
2. Physical Normality.
3. Normal Recreation.
4. Self Knowledge.
5. Energy and Enthusiasm.

Extremely individualized or spoiled children are little better than under-individualized children, unless the contact with school companions in early life "takes off

the rough edges," and introduces social as well as individual ideas. Here again the duty of regulating the training so as to prevent over-individualization is one that devolves upon the mother.

What of fatherhood? Shall the father play no part in the training of his children? Is he exempted from all responsibilities, merely because his business calls him away from home for a certain number of hours each day? By no means. Yet, while the present system of industry continues side by side with the present organization of the home, some division of work is inevitable. The housekeeping must fall to the lot of the married woman, and the income-getting to the lot of the married man. That both should participate in training the children is obvious; that the greater portion of this duty must devolve upon the woman is inevitable.

Thus home training may individualize the child. In the second place, it should provide robust bodies. There is a way to feed and clothe children which makes for health; there are many other ways which produce anemic, tubercular men and women. A strong body is an almost universally necessary basis of life work, for without it, the mind cannot do its best thinking nor can the heart manifest its best impulses.

The mal-nourished bodies, defective eyes and ears, deformed, misshapen bones and muscles of American school children, tell plainly and bluntly the story of the ignorance and inefficiency of American motherhood. How many mothers know what kinds of exer-

cise will correct a low shoulder or hip? How many mothers know even the first facts about physical development? There could be no more pointed plea for a well trained motherhood than that furnished by the manifold defects of American school children. Such conditions are not wholly the result of poverty, because these defects occur (though not so frequently) in the well-to-do as in the poverty-stricken neighborhoods. The physical defects of our boys, and the physical atrophy of our girls is due in large part to the ignorance of the women who brought those boys and girls into the world.

The women who choose motherhood in the new generation can, in the third place, provide recreation for their children. Education begins in the well directed plays of children. In play, Froebel believed, lay the germinal leaves of all later life, and from play he developed the noblest type of boyhood and girlhood. Play gives physical and mental development besides the training necessary for enabling children to establish and adhere to a code of action,—a moral code if you will,—which will determine their attitude in later life. "The child without a playground," says G. Stanley Hall, "is likely to become the father without a job." So too, the playless child, developed into a workless anti-social man, not only fails to add to the progress of society, but may even detract from it.

With a strong body and a well developed instinct for play, must go, in the fourth place, intimate self knowledge. The bodies, boys and girls, are wonder-

ful, God-given machines. With them, you do whatever work you may decide upon in life. Do you wish to help in the forward march of progress? You can do your best only when you have this machine in the best of repair, under perfect control, every cog oiled and clean, every lever in place. The body and mind of man are the most intricate mechanisms known. Each one of you is a mechanic in charge. As such, you must preserve your bodies and minds because they are the only instruments you will ever have with which to do your work. Thus approached, the subject of bodily hygiene becomes an interesting and a vital one.

When hygiene is taught thus, it furnishes the foundation for the expression of energy and enthusiasm, the fifth of the things which the home can give. It is energy which makes the world go. Each child is endowed with an abundance of it, which may be of untold value through proper direction, but may either fail, or result in infinite harm through disuse or abuse.

The consummation of all of these qualities is found in character. But it is not enough to make men and women efficient through the increase of knowledge and the development of judgment and ambition. In addition to these, sympathy, ideals, and inspiration lay the foundation for aspiration and character. Inspiration (the will to do) and sympathy (an appreciation of men and of things) come through contact with strong men and women. Nobility in the home will of necessity instill such qualities in the children.

The women who choose motherhood as a part of

their life work must create an ideal home—an atmosphere. The old physical basis for the home has disappeared. Food, clothing and shelter can be secured elsewhere as well as within the four walls of home; but sympathy, confidence, coöperation, and mutual aid,—the basis for every true home,—can be found only in the presence of strong mothers and fathers.

Through heredity, controlled in large measure by the selective power of women, comes the raw material of the new generation: through the home environment of early life come the forces which ennoble or debase this raw material. Here again it is the woman who determines, in this case almost exclusively, what the character of the home shall be. To his sixth or seventh year at least, the mother *per se* is the arbiter of the child's life.

CHAPTER XXIV

SCHOOL TRAINING

WHEN Dotheboys Hall flourished in England, the rod,—the scepter of educational authority,—was always wielded by a masculine arm. Even the Little Red Schoolhouse seldom knew a woman teacher. It was not, indeed, until the last generation that woman took over the profession of teaching, securing for herself an opportunity for training children which is second only to that of the mother. The American School Teacher—almost invariably a woman—takes the children at six, seven or eight years of age, and directs a large portion of their waking hours until they reach the high school.

The industrial revolution is primarily responsible for opening this new occupational field to women. Under the domestic system of industry, most children never went to school at all. Since all opportunity for learning the crafts and trades carried on by the father and the mother existed in the home, the home itself contained an education. But the industrial revolution, by removing industry from the home to the factory, has eliminated the home as an economic unit, and has made of the bread-winner a small part of a great machine, with little idea of his relation to his fellow workers or to the machine as a whole.

Modern industry has thus created a new field in education, substituting for the uniform system of apprenticeship which prevailed under the domestic system of industry a system of extreme industrial specialization.

The old education was calculated to prepare men and women for life in an average community where each man learned his trade by apprenticeship. Boys and girls under such circumstances were taught the three R's, but were not provided with any school training which would assist them directly in the pursuits of after life. Fifty years ago it was considered unnecessary to give girls much education; there were still many household trades which have since found their way into the factory, and all of the training necessary for the performance of housework could, therefore, be secured in the home. Both boys and girls, then, received a thorough apprenticeship training for their life work; neither needed specialized education.

But apprenticeship has vanished from modern industry, except in a few of the old hand-trades. Generally speaking, the demand of industry is for specialists. Education, then, to be successful, must meet this demand, and must replace the general education of the home by the specialized training of the school. To meet this need, a great school system has been organized, the extent of which may be judged by the following figures.

The latest report of the United States Commissioner of Education places the total number of scholars in all

of the schools of the United States at 19,550,770. Of this army of learners, 17,960,049 are in the elementary schools; 1,034,827 are in the secondary schools; 442,719 are in universities, colleges and professional schools.[1] Less than nine million and a half of the students are in private schools,—the remainder being in public institutions.

The most significant factor in this table of statistics is the overwhelming proportion of students in the elementary grades,—seventeen of the nineteen millions, —and the comparatively small number who reach colleges and normal schools,—only about five hundred thousand.

There are, in the public schools, 506,040 teachers at work in 257,851 school buildings, valued at $967,775,587. Each year $503,647,289 is turned over to this educational machine, and the amount has been increasing steadily year by year.[2]

This school system is a savings bank in which the country has decided to invest its funds. Each year the nation spends upon the public schools a sum sufficient to construct a Panama Canal, or a transcontinental railway system. The school is the greatest public investment in the United States, and the country expects from it a return commensurate with its investment. The schools present an established network of influence, evolved and reorganized through half a century of experiment, failure, and success.

[1] Report, Commissioner of Education, 1910, Vol. II.
[2] *Ibid.*, Vol. II, p. XIV.

The secondary schools with a million students, and the universities, colleges, and professional schools with five hundred thousand, are an increasingly important factor, but the broadest influence must be wielded by the elementary schools, which hold more than four-fifths of the students.

Furthermore, four-fifths of the children who enter American schools never go beyond the elementary grades. Any serious attempt to use the public school system as a vehicle for social education must, therefore, be directed toward the primary school. It is there that the great mass of pupils are enrolled,—it is there that the real work must be done.

Outside of the home, the nation presents no form of activity which may so greatly influence Social Progress as the work of teaching in school. Of the 494,958 teachers in all of the schools and colleges of the United States 390,463 or about 80 per cent are women. This percentage has grown continually during the past thirty years, as will be seen by the following table.[1]

1897-80 57.2 per cent of the teachers were women
1889-90 65.5 per cent of the teachers were women
1899-00 70.1 per cent of the teachers were women
1907-08 78.9 per cent of the teachers were women

The greatest opportunity for training exists in the elementary schools,—particularly in the cities, and it is in these city schools that the women teachers are

[1] Report of the Commission of Education for 1909, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1910, Vol. II, p. 611.

most numerous. In 699 cities, the Report of the Commission of Education shows that of the 10,051 supervising officers, 5,393 or 53 per cent are women, while of the 120,469 teachers, 110,137 (91 per cent) were women.[1] If the statistics were available, they would show a much higher percentage,—probably 98 or 99 per cent of all elementary teachers in cities, to be females. In the cities, therefore, the women have a majority of the supervising positions, and almost all of the teaching positions.

Beside the home, no American institution has so great an opportunity for shaping the lives of the children as the school. Shall that opportunity be utilized? The answer rests largely with the women who teach school.

The object of education, as before enunciated, is complete living. A perfect educational system would prepare those participating in it to live every phase of their lives, and to derive from life all possible benefit. Any educational system which enables men to live completely is therefore fulfilling its function. On the other hand, an educational system which does not prepare for life is not meeting the necessary requirements.

What elements in the school system may make for complete living? There is, in the first place, the school curriculum. At present this is a lifeless, meaningless thing which, as it stands, does not make for complete living. Whether she will or no, the teacher must follow this curriculum, yet it prescribes the minimum, not

[1] *Supra*, Vol. II, p. 629.

the maximum amount of work which a teacher may do. Between that minimum and maximum, the work of different teachers differs radically.

Visit a school building. In one room the children lounge, the floor is littered, the blackboards are half-cleaned,—the whole room is pervaded by a spirit of indifference. The next room, on the contrary, is pervaded by an atmosphere of contented industry. There are pictures on the walls; floors and blackboards are clean; the children are neat and orderly; the teacher is supreme. It is seldom that a child must be sent from such a room to the principal's office. The room itself is a sufficient explanation of the pupils' conduct. The first teacher teaches according to the curriculum, —the second as her love of the profession, and of her children dictates. The relative advantages and disadvantages of the two systems are obvious.

The elementary teacher may aim to develop in her pupils,—

1. Physique.
2. Mental originality.
3. Ideals,—or a dynamic outlook on life.

The healthy body, the foundation for effective school work, is created by organized play and exercise. Unfortunately the average teacher in an elementary city grade is so handicapped by numbers and cramped by lack of floor space, that neither play nor exercise can be attempted. While the opportunities of the city teacher are restricted in this direction, those teachers

who have charge of schools located in the country have an unparalleled opportunity for developing, through wisely organized play, the bodies of the boys and girls who come under their direction.

In mental training the teacher in a city school must do her best work. The partial failure of the American school system has been due to the treadmill methods by means of which useless and meaningless facts have been crammed into the children, irrespective of their interests or capacities. Dickens, in his characteristic way, thus describes a public school class under the title "murdering the innocents":

"In this life, we want nothing but Facts, sir; nothing but Facts."

"The speaker and the school master swept with their eyes the inclined plane of little vessels then and there arranged in order, ready to have imperial gallons of facts poured into them until they were full to the brim." "So Mr. M'Choakumchild (the School Master) began in his best manner. He went to work on this preparatory lesson, not unlike Morgiana in the Forty Thieves—looking into all the vessels ranged before him, one after another, to see what they contained. Say, good Mr. M'Choakumchild: when from thy store thou shalt fill each jar brim full by and by, dost thou think thou wilt always kill outright the robber Fancy lurking within—or sometimes only maim him and distort him!"[1]

The picture is overdrawn, perhaps, yet there are

[1] "Hard Times," Chapters I and II.

grades in most large American cities where conditions similar to those just portrayed may be found,—conditions which are in part due to poor administration, but also, in large measure due to uneducated, uninterested teachers.

The child of eight is an individual and should be treated as such by the school authorities. The individuality of the child's body is recognized and provided with an individual seat, but his poor little individual mind is crammed with a group of facts and principles which, intended for the mind of "the average child," fit neither his mind nor the mind of any one of the twenty thousand other children in the elementary grades of his city. Individual bodies; collective minds,—such is the official estimate of American school children. Yet where can a more individualistic group of youngsters be found than in that same class on the playground half an hour later?

The educational machinery of the city is a great, unwieldy organism. Its salvation lies in the teachers. If they choose to individualize the pupils and teach them as individuals, the system will be a success; but if they look upon each child as a little jug into which so many facts are to be poured, the system must inevitably fail.

Beyond and above the mental training for individuality of thought, the teacher can instill into the child ideals of life. Was there not in your life one teacher whom you will never forget? A teacher who inspired you to do your best; to think your noblest? That

teacher did for you the one thing which no curriculum or discipline, or system could do,—she gave you an exalted view of life.

Perhaps if each of us hitched his chariot to a star, there would not be enough stars to go around, but at least we might try the experiment. At any rate, there is a common goal toward which all may strive,—a goal of welfare and universal opportunity. There is a common philosophy of life in which all may share,—the philosophy which places the interests of the group above the petty selfish interests of the individual.

> "Breathes there a man with soul so dead,
> Who never to himself hath said,
> 'This is my own—my native land'?"

How trite, yet how true! Patriotism; College, Class and Civic Spirit;—What do all these things mean? Merely that the individual is looking beyond his own selfish ends to the larger interests of the group to which he belongs. Such social enthusiasm,—such group spirit,—has built civilizations in the past, and can revolutionize the world in the future; can abolish the spirit of graft which is eating its way into all phases of American life; can transcend the grasping desire for gain; and create through this new birth, a nation of individuals who are working together for the common good. Such a nation, through its influence, would lead the world.

This passion for social welfare,—this replacement of the spirit of personal gain by the spirit of social

service,—can be inspired by the teacher, and in many cases by her alone. Will she do it?

The women who teach in the elementary schools have in their charge the masses of tomorrow. The few who teach in the high schools and colleges have under their care the elect,—those who have sufficient ambition or whose parents have sufficient income to secure for them an effective education. With these teachers the problem is essentially the same as that which confronts the elementary school teacher. There are, however, greater advantages for intensive work. Classes are smaller, more intimate contact may be had with the students, who, selected from the great mass of elementary school pupils, will make up the leaders of the next fifty years.

The school is the hope of progress. Whether in the elementary, the secondary or the college classes, the work of progress will be done most effectively by the school teachers. Nine-tenths of the pupils never reach the high school; nineteen-twentieths never reach the colleges; the broadest work, therefore, is to be done in the elementary school; the deepest work in college.

Any reform of social ideas or ideals that is to be effected through the public schools must, for the present at least, be developed in the elementary grades. The greatest emphasis must be laid there, where there are the most children. The possibility of developing, through the medium of the public schools, a system of ideas or ideals in the general population, is far greater than by means of newspapers, magazines, or any other

agency that the country possesses. This is primarily because the public schools reach people while they are young, when impressions are made most easily and prove most indelible.

The public school presents practically the only organization which can be depended upon to develop and evolve a broad, sane feeling of social responsibility in the body politic. It is through the agency of the public school that the social conscience can and will be aroused. It will be necessary, if the school is to fulfill its function, to have introduced into the elementary grades, courses in biology, hygiene, politics, economics, and social problems, which will furnish instruction in three essential fields:—

1. Personal hygiene.
2. Parental duty and responsibility.
3. Social responsibility.

The most difficult problem confronting the schools is the teaching of a sense of social responsibility. Children should be taught that normal men and women are good, and that badness is merely an indication of abnormality. They should be shown the necessity for maintaining wages, standards, and modes of life. The teaching of individual morality must be supplemented by the teaching of social morality. It is antisocial to pay low wages, and the school children should know it; it is antisocial to maintain unhygienic living conditions in the houses which you own, and the children should be told so; the working life should be long and

joyous, and the schools should make this fact a part of the consciousness of every child. In this way can the school fulfill its duty. In this way can it develop a full sense of responsibility which every man must feel for his fellows in society.

The hope of progress is the school; the hope of the school is the teacher. Since nine-tenths of our teachers are women, it is obvious that upon women rests our hope of progress through education.

CHAPTER XXV

WOMEN IN MODERN INDUSTRY

How inconsistent are people! In the opening years of the twentieth century, men assemble and gravely discuss the right of women to enter industry; protest against the increasing numbers of women who are taking up gainful occupations; and bitterly assail these women for encroaching on "man's field." Man's field indeed!

Among all savage peoples, the women are the workers,—they till the soil, make the clothing, weave and cook. All of the crafts and many of the arts originate with women. When man, through reason, discovered that he was stronger than women, he subjugated her and put her to work. From that period dates the beginning of industry.

It is not, however, until late in history that men take up those industrial pursuits which are most easily separated from the routine of domestic pursuits. Thus, a system of division of occupations gradually develops. The women accept as their share those occupations which clearly come closest to the management of the household, yielding to men those occupations which are concerned primarily with the production

of articles for barter or sale. Even as late as the end of the domestic system, women assisted men in these productive enterprises,—spun and wove, knitted, tanned and forged.

Toward the end of the eighteenth century a number of discoveries and inventions laid the basis for modern industry, making it possible for men to achieve results of surpassing magnitude. Immediately the leaders of activity, who, up to that time, had concerned themselves primarily with military ventures and statesmanship, turned their energies into the broadening fields of industry.

Then, one by one the industries left the home; industries which had belonged to women since the organization of human society; industries which women had originated and developed; industries which had been hers for millions of years. Yet today, when women purpose, after a temporary absence of a century, to return to the tasks of their great-great-grandmothers, a great masculine outcry is raised,—"Leave these industries. They are ours, you are trespassers, and we the rightful masters."

However, men have transformed, and vastly improved industrial processes. They have introduced into industry that most fundamental of all social forces, coöperation, so generally neglected by women. They have relieved their muscles and backs of the heaviest burdens by harnessing steam, electricity, water, and forcing them to do the lifting and carrying. By these transformations they have rendered

industry even more suitable for women than it was when taken from the home.

Masculine ingenuity has standardized industry. A man no longer makes a shoe, a nail, or an overcoat; rather he coöperates with a hundred or a thousand other persons, each of whom, like himself, has some small and apparently meaningless operation to perform. These specialized operations, however, are anything but meaningless; organized and directed by a captain of industry, they create a completed product.

This intense specialization, developed in recent years, has divided labor horizontally into groups,—consisting, broadly, of unskilled, semi-skilled and skilled laborers. The division is comparatively recent, because under a craftsmanship system, each man, learning his trade as an apprentice, became ultimately a skilled or master craftsman. From apprentice to journeyman, from journeyman to master craftsman, was a series of steps which most of the industrial workers climbed,—even those who never became masters were nevertheless skilled, thoroughly trained mechanics. In contrast to this old system, under which a man received a rounded education in his business, the system of specialization which has replaced the handicraft system permits of little apprenticeship. Each man, with or without the aid of a machine, creates a small part of a given product. The worker, in performing this single operation, becomes not skilled, but dextrous. Hence, while his total product has been made larger through

specialization and organization, his training is along the narrowest lines.

Women could not engage in many of the old handicraft trades because of the long apprenticeship required for them. Now, with industrial standardization, women may engage not only in the occupations which men took from the home, but in many other occupations and professions which have never been directly associated with the home. A few months, or at most a few years, equips the woman for her specialized occupation, which she may pursue, as she sees fit, until she has children to care for.

There has never been a time when women were really out of industry. As Edith Abbott so ably points out in her recent book,[1] women have worked in industry since the organization of the factory system. In fact, when the loom left the home, the woman went with it into the factory. Therefore the present entrance of women into industry is merely a transitional process, and normal in so far as the women are concerned. Since the time when old hand tools were displaced by the power-driven machinery of the factory, the women have been leaving their homes, and taking their places before the new factory implement.

More than five million women were working for wages when the last census was taken.[1] Decade by

[1] "Women in Industry," Edith Abbott, New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1910, Chapters II, III, IV and V.

[2] All of the figures in this Chapter are taken from the Census Bulletin, "Woman in Occupations," published by the Census Office, in Washington, 1907, based on the Census of 1900.

decade, the number has been constantly increasing, yet not out of proportion to the numbers of women in the country. In fact the numbers of men engaging in manufacturing and mechanical pursuits has increased faster than the number of women so engaged. This is probably the result of the immigrant tide, three quarters of which is male.

A brief analysis of the facts regarding the women workers of the United States will throw many side-lights on the woman's industrial problems. There were, according to the twelfth census, 485,767 women, 10-15 years of age, engaged in gainful occupations. Of this number, 42.7 per cent were engaged in Agriculture (chiefly cotton picking in the South); 29.2 per cent were engaged in Domestic and Personal Service; and 23.3 per cent were in Manufacturing and Mechanical Pursuits. This leaves 4.8 per cent for Professional Service and Trade and Transportation.

Our chief interest centers around the 4,833,630 women, 16 years of age and over, who were gainfully employed in 1900. These women make up exactly one-fifth (20.6 per cent) of all of the women 16 years of age and over in the United States.

Most of the women who work are quite young,—of the 4,833,630 gainfully employed,—

44.2 per cent are from 16 to 24 years of age
24.2 per cent are from 25 to 34 years of age
14.0 per cent are from 35 to 44 years of age

Thus, nearly half of the working women are under 25, while seven-tenths are under 35. These figures

demonstrate beyond question the contention that most women work only until they get an opportunity to marry. Occupation is, in fully two-thirds of the cases, a makeshift, which is dispensed with when the chance to marry comes.

The brevity of their industrial career gives to the women little incentive for good work, and no incentive at all for the mastery of skilled trades or professions. Any year "the right man" may come along, so "what is the use of wasting my time learning a skilled trade?"

The labor market in the United States presents this interesting aspect: at the bottom of the scale, among the unskilled laborers, a great over-supply of men and women; among the semi-skilled, an equal supply and demand; but among the skilled a demand almost always exceeding the supply. This condition is aggravated among men by the influx of unskilled immigrants. It is doubly aggravated among women by the presence of three million women wage earners who are not in industry to stay; who do not learn any art or trade, and who, therefore, stand at the bottom of the ladder, clamoring for a place to work, but ready to relinquish it at the first desirable opportunity for marriage. As they are untrained, they are thoroughly unfitted to do anything except the most simple work. They work in bad surroundings for worse than starvation wages,—shouldering each other for places which are in themselves thoroughly undesirable. Miss Dorothy Richardson, writing in "The Long

Day,"[1] has very interestingly portrayed the well-nigh hopeless dilemma of the unskilled working girl. On the other hand, the experience of the Manhattan Trade School (New York) has demonstrated conclusively that there is always a place for the trained, efficient girl worker.

The transitory nature of the industrial life of working women is further demonstrated by their conjugal condition. Among this group of 4,833,630 women workers, 16 years of age and over, 3,143,712 are single, 769,477 are married, 857,005 are widowed, 63,436 are divorced.

The single women thus constitute the majority of those gainfully employed. In fact, of the single women in the United States, 45.9 per cent are working for wages. The contrast between this percentage and the 5.6 per cent of married women who are working is striking. Widowed and divorced women are also very generally employed, the percentage for widowed women being 31.5 per cent, and that for divorced women being 55.3 per cent. Thus nearly half of all single women are at work, while more than half of all divorced women are at work.

Work for gain is much more common among city than it is among country women. In the cities of 50,000 population and over, 28.3 per cent of all women 16 years and over were employed; while in the smaller cities and in country districts, the percentage was only 18.0 per cent.

[1] "The Long Day," Dorothy Richardson, New York, The Century Co., 1905.

The discussion of working girls' homes, and the difficulties which confront the single girl who wishes to be decent in a big city, lend especial interest to the figures which show the family relationship of women gainfully employed. Taking 27 cities, in which 1,232,268 girls were at work, it appears that,—

64.8 per cent lived at home
11.9 per cent were heads of families
26.3 per cent were living with father
12.2 per cent were living with mother
14.5 per cent were living with other relatives
35.2 per cent boarded

Thus one-third of the working women in American cities live away from home.

Women are gradually returning to their own. As the development of industry takes more and more of the occupations out of the household and places them in the factory, women follow them and take up factory work.

It is neither wrong nor right for women to enter industry, it is logical and inevitable. The problem is not a problem in ethics, but one in economics. Women, like other human creatures, must have some constructive occupation. Such an occupation was formerly provided in the home, but since the home has ceased to provide it, women must seek it elsewhere,—in the factory, the office and the store.

CHAPTER XXVI

THE NEW ALIGNMENT OF INDUSTRIAL OCCUPATIONS

"I AM a Senior in High School. I don't want to go to college; I can't bear bridge or society. What shall I do?"

"I am a College Senior. I have my life before me, and I am going to make my life count. How can I use it to the best advantage?"

We hear these, and similar remarks, repeated time after time by the younger generation of American girls. What shall we tell these girls? Shall we ask them to go home and fold their hands? Must they idle away the years until they find a suitable husband? Suppose they never find a man who suits them, must they waste their youthful energy and their mature power in waiting? What a disaster! What an opportunity for the advocate of conservation.

In most of their calculations regarding constructive, industrial, social and political problems, men blindly overlook one-half the human race. Their reply to these two girls, if they make any at all, would be, "My dears, your place is at home. You can't find anything to do? Well, perhaps your mother needs your company." If the mother is doing nothing she undoubtedly does, for misery always loves company.

But these girls are not to be so answered. They are capable, trained, efficient. They aspire to a place in the constructive work of the world, and whether we like it or not, they will take it. Aside from eugenic and domestic opportunities, aside from teaching at home and in school, women have a place in industry. They consume, why should they not produce? They share in the fruits of industrial effort, and they should justly share in its burdens and responsibilities, providing always the industrial field exists into which women can easily go.

There are certain fields which may reasonably be closed to women. All those occupations which demand great physical strength belong of right to men. Thus the heavy work in the steel mills; much of the work in the structural trades (structural iron work, heavy carpentry, stone mason work and the like), mining coal, smelting and refining iron and other minerals; most common labor work, picking, shoveling, lifting, carrying,—these tasks are men's tasks. It is no argument to say that in Europe, women are hitched to the plow; that in South America they dig and toil in the streets; that the immigrant woman who comes to America is capable of enduring hard manual labor. To be sure she is, and she does it, but by the time she reaches her fortieth year, she is old,—old as she should be at sixty.

The physique of women may be improved. It may be possible to develop the Spartan ideal,—a woman as strong physically as any man,—but today no

civilized women measure up to that requirement.

Then, too, those trades requiring a long apprenticeship must usually fall to men. Most women who are engaged in industry are between twenty and thirty years of age. That is, women work until they get married. Obviously a woman who is likely to marry at twenty-seven will not spend the years from sixteen to twenty-one in learning a trade which she can practice for only six years. In the case of the vast majority, therefore, women will not learn apprenticeship trades.

If this analysis is correct, it necessarily follows that trades demanding strength and skill primarily will be closed to most women. The steel industry, for example, is one demanding either strength or skill, or both. Among the laborers in the yard gangs, strength is the only requisite, but among the men who direct the operations of the rolling mill, both strength and skill are required. Women are peculiarly unfitted for the long hours of heavy work in a steel plant, and practically no women work in the mills. The Federal investigation of the South Bethlehem Steel Works (1910) discovered 9184 male employes with not a single female. Such trades are the exception, not the rule. Each year mechanical power is called upon to do more and more of the heavy lifting and carrying work; each year, standardization becomes more complete; each year some of the apprenticeship workers are replaced by standardized machines. The trades from which women are excluded by lack of strength

and long apprenticeship are comparatively few, and continually decreasing in numbers. The great majority of industries, at least in some of their phases, are open to women.

But a steel mill is the extreme illustration of an occupation dominated by men. While strength and apprenticeship make men dominant in some fields, dexterity and perseverance make women dominant in others. Some industries are almost completely feminized. For example, of all dressmakers in the United States, 99.4 per cent are females. Dressmaking work, requiring in most cases dexterity and perseverance rather than skill or strength, appeals particularly to the aptitudes and training of women, hence the Census Bulletin on Women's Work reports 338,144 women dressmakers and 2042 men. Dressmaking (for hire) is a woman's occupation.

Between these two extremes, the steel industry dominated by men and the dressmaking industry dominated by women, there are all gradations of occupational pursuits. As the demand for skill and strength is replaced by the demand for dexterity and perseverance, women replace men in industry. Those industries which, through the demand for apprenticeship or physical tasks or both, are still too heavy to be handled by women, are dominated by men; on the other hand, those industries in which specialization is replacing apprenticeship and skill are dominated by women. On the one hand are strength and skill; on the other, dexterity and perseverance.

Percentage of Women		Percentage of Men	
99.4	Dressmakers	0.6	
98.0	Milliners	2.0	
94.7	Housekeepers	5.3	
86.8	Laundets and Laundresses	13.2	
81.6	Paper Box Manufacturing	18.4	
77.6	Shirt, collar and cuff	22.4	
76.7	Stenographers and Typewriters	23.3	
72.8	Hosiery and knit goods	27.2	
62.6	Glove makers	37.4	
50.5	Book Binders	49.5	
REQUISITES: DEXTERITY AND PERSEVERANCE			REQUISITES: STRENGTH AND SKILL
50.0	Textile mill operatives	50.0	
46.2	Carpet manufacturing	53.8	
40.8	Woolen manufacturing	59.2	
30.9	Tobacco and cigars	59 1	
25.0	Paper and pulp mills	75.0	
18.2	Boot and shoe manufacturing	81.8	
10.3	Printers, lithographers, etc.	89.7	
8.3	Agriculture	91.7	
4.43	Laborers	95.7	
2.9	Manufacturing and Mechanical Pursuits (genl.)	97.1	

Here, then, is the new alignment of industrial occupations. Under the domestic system, this alignment was fairly complete. Under the factory system, it is completing itself. Under the domestic system the man did the heaviest of the work, leaving the lighter work for women. The factory system has removed practically all of the old home trades to factory buildings leaving the unskilled trades in the home. Women have left the home, and following the alignment of the old domestic industry, have again taken up those trades requiring dexterity and perseverance.

Some estimate of the extent to which this alignment has already been carried may be gained from the diagram on the opposite page.

The time is doubtless coming when this alignment will be more complete. Women, going into the industry of the next generation, will practically determine their field. Those trades which require a comparatively short apprenticeship, and which demand no heavy physical work, will be their trades. Women will not be prevented from entering other trades, but will naturally concentrate here. These trades, recognized as peculiarly feminine, will be held open for women, so that the woman who wishes to enter productive industry in 1950 will find her field well marked and distinctive.

CHAPTER XXVII

WOMEN IN SPECIFIC EMPLOYMENTS

THE statistics of women gainfully employed are interesting, since they indicate general tendencies, yet they offer little help to those who are so anxiously asking, "What can I do when I leave High School?" "What is there open to me when I graduate from college?" These girls are not ready to marry, and they do not wish to idle at home. What line of activity shall they pursue?

It is all very well to say in general terms, that industry is standardizing; that work is becoming more specialized; that women should be trained; that they should above all else avoid getting into the rut of the unskilled worker, but that does not help the individual girl. Consequently she stands and protests, "But what shall *I* do?" with an "I" as big as the one in the fable.

Although each case must be determined on its own merits there are certain general principles which govern women's occupations.

In the first place, there are three classes of girls:

1. Those girls who have had the equivalent of a grammar school education or less.

2. Those girls who have been through high school.
3. The college graduate, and the girl with training equivalent to college in some specialized form.

Four-fifths of the girls never get to high school; one-twentieth graduate from high school, and one one-hundredth graduate from college.

The girl with a grammar school education or less is, from the standpoint of industry, thoroughly untrained. She may be able to read and write, but she has no special trade or craft. She is, therefore, an unskilled worker, and must seek her place in some form of gainful occupation which requires little skill or experience, and which can be readily mastered.

There are twelve industries in the United States reporting the employment of more than 100,000 women. Arranged in accordance with the number of women employed, these industries are:—[1]

	OCCUPATIONS	NUMBER EMPLOYED
1.	Servants and waitresses	1,165,561
2.	Agricultural laborers	456,405
3.	Dressmakers	338,144
4.	Laundresses	328,935
5.	Teachers	327,206
6.	Farmers	307,706
7.	Textile operators	231,458
8.	Housekeepers and stewardesses	146,929
9.	Sales women	142,265

[1] "Statistics of Women at Work, 1900," Census Bureau, Washington, Government Printing Office, 1907, p. 32.

10. Seamstresses 138,724
11. Nurses and midwives..... 108,691
12. Laborers 106,916

Of these twelve industries at least six require little or no previous training, and hence are open to unskilled girls. Servants and waitresses, Agricultural laborers (almost wholly in the Southern States) Laundresses, Textile operators, Sales women, and Laborers, are positions which require generally a low grade of training, and hence these pursuits do not handicap, by lack of a previous education, the girls who are taking them up. To be sure, among many of the Laundresses, Textile operators, and Sales women, a very considerable amount of skill and training is required, but generally this is not so in these six occupations.

The industrial opportunity for untrained women is unattractive but very wide. Half of the leading women's occupations fall within this class, and there are tens of thousands of Dressmakers and Housekeepers and Stewardesses who have little real training.

The girls of this first class are like the sands of the sea for number, and their wages reflect the bitter competition which results from their numbers. In the standardized trades which they enter, these unskilled girls cut one another down to the lowest figure, often working for wages which barely afford a living. As one little Italian girl said in the recent shirtwaist makers strike—"Me no live vera much on forta-nine cent a day." The forty-nine cents was the product of

the ignorance of this girl and others like her, who go to work unprepared, and therefore unable to demand living wages.

The immediate responsibility for a lack of training rests on the school system, which, instead of preparing for life the millions of girls who leave below the high school, merely fills their memories with a conglomeration of unimportant facts. It is the girl, however, who bears the burden.

The high school girl (group 2) who has taken a course in a commercial or trade high school is thoroughly prepared to do some one thing. She may know stenography, millinery, accounting, or some similar trade. She is at least a factor to be reckoned with.

A glance at the table will show that more than three hundred thousand women are teachers, most of whom are high school graduates or their equivalent; that women farmers are in many instances well educated, that the great majority of nurses are trained women. Each one of these fields, with their hundreds of women, presents a wide range of opportunity for the high school graduate.

There are five other occupations employing from 80,000 to 100,000 women, in which the high school graduate has a broad opportunity. They are:[1]

OCCUPATIONS	NUMBER EMPLOYED
Stenographers and typewriters	85,086
Milliners	82,936
Clerks and copyists	81,000

[1] Idem.

Bookkeepers and accountants 72,896
Musicians and teachers of music.....52,019

Each of these occupations presents a wide range for choice. Girls with a fair amount of training can in nearly all of these industries secure a reasonable livelihood.

It is impossible to pass this group without indicating the field for women which the new agricultural high school is developing. Small fruits, flowers, small stock, and even light trucking present attractive opportunities to the girl living in a rural district, who is inclined to make her living in the country. Indeed, the sharp competition for opportunity in the city on the one hand, and on the other the development of scientific agriculture, the perfection of agricultural machinery, and the rising price of agricultural products, afford the woman farmer on a small scale ample opportunity to secure a good livelihood.

So much for the group of high school graduates. Their choices of occupation are wide, and their opportunities considerable.

Group 3, including the college and normal school graduate, contains the salt of the earth from the woman's standpoint. Physically robust from the splendid course in physical training, and the invigorating games of college life; trained to think accurately and clearly; learned in method of study and presentation; effective through the power of coöperation; and thoroughly alive to the desirability of making time and life count, these college girls furnish the

most optimistic argument for the future of women.

The college girl with her atmosphere of efficiency and capability, has penetrated every group of women who have the time and intelligence to think. Whether college trained or not, the women of America are taking their cue from the college graduate. They see in her the prototype of what they might have been, and they take from her successes new inspiration for their efforts. The college girl is the type of the future for women.

But what shall she do? She can do anything she pleases. The professions are fully open to her; Journalism is a new, good field; she may venture independently into Business, she may engage in Social Work or in Teaching. She may, and no doubt she will ultimately, direct a home, but she need not necessarily lay aside all work to do so.

What are the chances for the college girl? What fields may she enter?

The college girls are few in number, and the occupations into which they can go are widely distributed. Teaching presents the most generally chosen field for the college girl graduate. While no general statistics are available showing what proportion of 327,206 women teachers are college graduates, the available data from the colleges themselves show that more than half of the graduates are or have been teachers.

The learned professions are claiming a percentage, though a small one, of the graduates of girls' colleges. A few enter Law and Medicine; a few become journal-

ists; a still smaller proportion take up Secretarial work. According to the Census returns, there are only 5,984 women in "literary and scientific" pursuits, and 7,387 "physicians and surgeons." While most of these are probably college graduates, there is no method of accurately determining the proportion.

A more concrete idea of the occupations in which college girls engage may be gained from the following statement regarding 1076 women who received the degree of Bachelor of Arts from Bryn Mawr College between 1888 and 1910. The Bryn Mawr College statistics are particularly interesting, since the college has always endeavored to impress upon its graduates the necessity for some kind of activity. Of these 1076 graduates:—

27.0 per cent are married, with no paid occupation
25.6 per cent are unmarried, with no paid occupation
22.5 per cent are teachers in schools
3.8 per cent are teachers in colleges
2.6 per cent have unpaid positions in social work
2.0 per cent have paid positions in social work
1.8 per cent are private tutors
1.2 per cent are private secretaries
1.2 per cent are physicians
0.6 per cent are lawyers

The remainder are variously engaged as students of different subjects.[1]

Though the college woman has not yet attempted wide fields of effort, the future is hers. She has training and mental grasp, she has learned to coöperate,

[1] Bryn Mawr Calendar, Bryn Mawr College, Bryn Mawr, January, 1911, p. 273.

and has thoroughly prepared herself to be a factor in occupational effort.

The kind of work which a woman may pursue thus varies with the time, the place and the girl. It is impossible to say definitely what this girl or that girl may do because capacity, inclination and opportunity vary so widely in each specific case, yet a few general principles have been laid down which are universally true. Briefly,—

1. The more training a girl can secure—provided it is specific, the better.

2. The college girl has the right of way in all vocations requiring intellectually trained women.

3. The girl who cannot go to high school should try to secure an occupation in which some skill can be acquired by an apprenticeship.

4. Each girl should suit her trade to her inclination, and go to work as if she meant to stay.

A fifth of the women in the United States are gainfully employed, yet gainful occupations constitute but one element—and a very insignificant element, too, in the category of things that American women may do. To the individual girl or woman industrial pursuits are of vital importance, but socially considered the eugenic, domestic, and educational opportunities of American women far outweigh in importance the opportunities in industry. Nevertheless, all women

should be occupied since, as Carlyle very well points out, blessedness comes oftenest through work.

The occupations which are involved in training the future and moulding the home environment are from a standpoint of Social Progress the vital occupations for women to perform.

CHAPTER XXVIII

PHILANTHROPY

One of the chief aims of the Christian Religion is to instill ideas of sympathy and self sacrifice. Perhaps, as some scientists maintain, the concept of sympathy was first developed by women. In any case, sympathy has certainly been a preëminently feminine characteristic during historic times. Men have murdered and wounded: women have mourned and stanched the flow of blood.

Charles Kingsley writes his "Three Fishers," with this refrain::

> "For men must work—
> And women must weep."

Surrounded by such an atmosphere, Walter Scott writes:

> "Oh woman, in our hours of ease,
> Uncertain, coy and hard to please,
> And variable as the shade
> By the light quivering aspen made—
> When pain and anguish wring the brow,
> A ministering angel thou."

Woman is an uncertain quantity, thinks the poet, until some catastrophe occurs. Then it is she who aids the afflicted, or weeps over the dead.

Such a concept of woman's attitude toward life is

truly absurd if carried to the extreme, yet it is doubtless founded on a psychological truth. Women feel pity more keenly than men. They are more impulsive, naturally, and acting on their impulses rush involuntarily to the assistance of distress with an intuition that is peculiarly feminine.

Women are, on the whole, more altruistic than men. While girls develop altruism at 12 or 13, similar manifestations are not apparent in boys until 14 or 15, and sometimes much later.[1] Even after altruistic feeling is developed in children, it manifests itself much less generally in the male than in the female sex. While the studied self-repression of the male is doubtless a factor in preventing the manifestation of altruistic feelings, there still appears to be a fundamental difference in the attitude of the two sexes.

Granted the prevalence of altruism among women, their passion for Social Service through Philanthropy is easily explained.

The present decade has witnessed a great movement of women into the field of philanthropic work. Unmarried, unoccupied women, high school and college graduates, women whose home duties are not exacting,—all of these classes are turning to philanthropy as an outlet for their altruistic impulses. Settlement work, neighborly visiting among the poor, directorships in children's societies, investigations of working conditions,—all furnish abundant opportunities for

[1] "Social Development and Education," M. V. O'Shea, Boston, Houghton Mifflin Co., 1909, Part I.

contact with social problems of appalling magnitude. Books like those of Jacob Riis, and Jane Addams; articles in magazines and newspapers; together with courses on applied sociology and economics have called wide-spread attention to these problems, bringing with the knowledge of conditions an irresistible call to service.

The field of Philanthropy is broadening each year. The old type of charity, represented by soup kitchens, bread-lines, indiscriminate almsgiving, is being rapidly replaced by the new type of scientific preventive work. The old time social worker asked no questions, but gave freely. The modern worker asks why aid must be given. Unemployment, ignorance, sickness, liquor, vice, and a score of other factors cause poverty and distress. Relief is important, but not nearly so vital as prevention of further need for relief.

The campaign against tuberculosis is a typical preventive effort. Instead of merely trying to cure the tuberculous person, the worker against the disease first makes sure that it will not be communicated to the other members of the family, and then, after a careful study of the facts, shows the relation between bad housing, under-feeding, ignorance, and tuberculosis. Tuberculosis is not a cause, but an effect of bad social conditions, hence until the bad conditions are removed, it must continue.

In this, and in many similar ways, modern philanthropy is emphasizing the necessity of building a fence along the edge of the cliff, rather than maintain-

ing an ambulance down in the valley to rescue people after they have fallen over. Prevention is far more fundamental than cure. All social work does not yet reflect this spirit, yet the advanced social workers in all lines fully appreciate its significance.

The recipients of philanthropic activities are ordinarily grouped as,—

1. The Dependents.
2. The Defectives.
3. The Delinquents.

As these three D's lead directly to the fourth D which begins the word Damnation, it is essential that they be relieved as speedily and as effectively as possible.

The Dependents,—paupers, orphans, beggars, deserted or temporarily distressed families, form the core of the "charity" problem. The children who are left destitute are worthy of effort, though the adults are in most cases worthless. Nevertheless, for the sake of the children, dependent families must be relieved, though the parents are obviously unworthy.

The Defectives constitute an altogether different problem. Mental defect is usually incurable and sometimes unimprovable. Physical defects, such as blindness, chronic disease, and the like, may usually be relieved or cured. On the whole, the work with the Defectives is most hopeful, since each year adds evidence in favor of the contention that the vast majority of men are normal, and if given an opportunity to do so, will lead normal lives.

Delinquency, even more than dependence and defect, is the result of bad surroundings. With the rare exception of the born criminal, most delinquents are trained. They fall among thieves at an early age, and learn the gentle art of thievery; they live in squalid homes, or amid vicious surroundings, and become vicious because of the vice which surrounds them. In nine cases out of ten,—in fact, in 95 cases out of a hundred, delinquent boys, when given an opportunity, make good citizens.

Orphanages and almshouses care for the Dependent; homes, institutions, hospitals, provide for the feeble-minded and other Defectives, while juvenile courts, houses of refuge, reformatories, penitentiaries and the like, house the Delinquent. Each of these institutions has been the object of special study. The whole problem has been submitted to trained experts, who during the last generation have squarely faced both cure and prevention, and in most cases have told fearlessly of the needs. The vast majority of these workers, both trained and untrained, have been women.

While no accurate figures are extant, giving the proportion of men and women in social work, Dr. Samuel McCune Lindsay, Director of the New York School of Philanthropy, writes:—[1] "There are no accurate statistics of the relative number of men and women in social work. I can only give you a personal impression based on the proportion that has been pretty regularly maintained in the School of Philanthropy as

[1] In a letter, dated May 12, 1911.

a fair index of the proportion to be found in social work generally; that is, four-fifths women, one-fifth men."

While most of the money for Philanthropy has in the past been contributed by men, during the last two decades women, coming into the possession of more and more extensive fortunes, have contributed largely to the work. The largest single Social Work Foundation,—$10,000,000 for the study of special problems,—was established by a woman,—Mrs. Russell Sage. Up to the present time, however, woman's contribution has usually taken the form of time and energy, spent in visiting, investigating, and organizing. Such a field is, of course, strictly limited to those few well-to-do women who have abundant leisure to devote to work outside the home.

Social work which was originally done by broken-down clergymen, is today a science, with its schools and advanced courses in investigation. While the untrained worker held the field, he made little progress, but with the advent of the expert, came a wide-spread opportunity for effective work. This opportunity opened at the time that the woman's college was graduating large numbers of women animated by a desire to play some effective part in social advance. The demand and the supply were contemporaneous, and for a decade, college women have been pouring into social work.

The advent of the college girl has had two effects. It speedily raised the standard of social work far

above its old level, and at the same time it practically closed the door of opportunity for social work to any but college women. The manager who can get a college graduate for $50 a month is not going to employ a high school graduate at $40. The value of college training is too apparent to be overlooked, and the college graduate secures the position.

Philanthropy must always be limited because of the limitation in funds and donations. The work required in the average philanthropic organization is hard and exacting. Strong bodies, resolute minds, and a joyous determination to do good work are just as essential in this field as in any other. As the college graduate has preëmpted the field of social work, the field is severely limited.

This has become even truer since the establishment of a number of schools for social workers which furnish a course of a year, or more, through which the college graduate is asked to pass before beginning practical work.

The real value of social work consists in its revelation of existing conditions to the social worker. A girl, shielded all her life from everything that offends or makes unclean, goes into a room with no exit in the outside air; with a candle burning dimly in one corner; close with the heavy atmosphere of a hot July, rendered unbearable by stale breath, and the odor of greasy clothes; with two little children groveling in a pile of filth and rags on the floor, and with a mother and a four-weeks-old baby lying in the only bed. Never in

her life has she known that such things exist, yet the lecturers tell her that there are 50,000 such rooms in her city alone. She begins to think. She goes on the street at night; finds girls of fifteen, soliciting men; traces them to the white slave dens from which they came; and learns that the whole district reeks with prostitution, which is aided and protected by the police. She is horrified, yet she thinks harder still. Social work is an incentive to thought, and thus performs one of its most useful functions.

The field of Philanthropy is limited; only a favored few, with special opportunities can enter it, yet for them it is a spur to tireless activity.

CHAPTER XXIX

THE SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE OF WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS

A PROGRESSIVE, earnest man was requested to act on the Board of Managers of a philanthropic organization. Leaning forward in his chair he asked quickly, "Are there any women on it?" The reply was negative. The man sank back with a sigh of relief. "They're so unpractical," said he, "and they will never coöperate."

This man was wrong. Women will coöperate if the work in which they are engaged appears to lend itself to immediate coöperative effort; otherwise they seem hopelessly individualistic.

Generations and centuries have passed over woman —as a domestic worker. Individually, in her home, she has toiled to secure the ends for which her life seemed to be given. In the bearing and rearing of children, and in domestic industry,—coöperation was practically impossible. So women labored on in ignorance, bearing individually the burden of their work.

Meanwhile men had learned. The phalanx, coöperating, unified, overcame a mob of ten times its numbers because the phalanx was an organization, and

because under the law of coöperation, the phalanx must subdue everything less organized than itself. Thus, through military exploits, men learned the value of mutual helpfulness,—learned it where the penalty of failure was death. Later the same principle so thoroughly mastered in the military world was applied to industry. One man could make one pair of shoes in a day,—but ten men brought together in a factory and taught to coöperate could produce thirty pairs of shoes in one day. So in every walk of life which he has entered, man has introduced the modes of coöperative effort.

Meanwhile women worked on individually in the homes. Coöperation seemed impossible. Each woman tended her own fire; cooked her own food; washed her own pots and pans and swept her own floor.[1] Thus the tradition arose that women had not the capacity to coöperate.

There was one field,—the church,—in which women did unified work. Have you ever attended a church festival, fair or supper, organized and run by women? It is usually a model of efficiency and dispatch. The situation is always a difficult one. Some of the women balk, others gossip and "back-bite," nevertheless, they organize a fair, and a successful fair, too. It was probably in the church that women received their first lessons in coöperation. From these simple beginnings, however, the work has spread far and fast.

[1] "The Home," C. P. Gilman, New York, McClure, Phillips & Co., 1903.

In clubs,
In social and civic organizations,
In agitation for political rights,
In industrial unions,

women have demonstrated beyond question their capacity for organization. Perhaps, after all, the thing which prevented coöperation in the past was not woman's inherent incapacity to coöperate, so much as the great burden of an individualized social institution, the home,—so organized, and so surrounded by precedent and tradition, that it rendered coöperation well nigh impossible.

Whether or not this be the true explanation, it is certainly the most plausible, since the women of twentieth-century America, with their college training, freedom from social restrictions, and incentive to organized effort, are making wonderful strides toward a type of coöperation that will lead in the direction of Social Progress.

The Woman's Club is not a distinctive product of the activity of American women, yet there is probably no country in the world where the Woman's Club has been so potent a factor in emancipating women from the bonds of traditional subservience.

The movement for political rights is not an outgrowth of the Woman's Club movement, it is contemporaneous with it. Woman Suffrage receives its tens of thousands of converts through the new view which is instilled in the club meetings and discussions.

The Woman's Trade Union League is a movement

of an entirely different character. Clubs, civic associations and suffrage appeal primarily to the woman of leisure. The Woman's Trade Union League voices the protest of American working women against the notoriously bad conditions surrounding the work of women and children. Men began trade union agitation in the early years of the last century (1803), but it was not until nearly a hundred years later that women chose to demonstrate their capacity in similar directions.

Women have always been taken into some of the men's unions, but the growth of certain trades,—such as glove making, coat and suit making, shirt, collar, and shirtwaist manufacturing and the like,—employing women almost exclusively,—made such coöperation impossible. The men were no longer on hand to agitate, and the women did not organize. The result in many cases was low wages, long hours and insanitary, revolting conditions of work. Into this unorganized field came a few strong women,—some of them suffragettes, some of them radicals,—who were determined to secure fair conditions of work for the working woman. The result of their agitation was the National Woman's Trade Union League.

The League has directed several strikes in the big cities, and in most cases has won them. Girls strike just as hard as men. They make good pickets and aggressive, earnest strikers, but their resources are not so great, and they have more difficulty in getting temporary jobs. Nevertheless, the National Woman's

Trade Union League has raised the working standard of tens of thousands of American working girls.

Thus from the leisure woman in her luxurious Club-House to the shirtwaist maker in the twilight of her Union Meeting Hall, the women of the United States have been organizing. Through these efforts they have shown beyond cavil woman's capacity.

The direct achievements of the woman's club are almost nil. On the other hand, its indirect influence has been very far-reaching. Women were asked to assemble in the Club House that they might study and discuss, and, to the astonishment of the doubting world, they came together peaceably. Obliterating social barriers, forgetting family traditions, women of diverse interests sat in a common meeting hall, or around a common committee table, and joined in the analysis of civic and social questions. The triumph was not in the discussion, but in the coöperation of the women.

An observer, three decades ago, viewing the attitude of American women, and looking forward into the future, would scarcely have dared to predict a city, state, sectional and national organization of women's clubs; a National and International Congress of mothers. Yet that end has at last been achieved. Slowly, hesitatingly, she has assembled, discussed, organized, combined, federated, until the power of a State Federation, led by an aggressive woman, is really to be reckoned with in the polity of a state.

This power is, however, incidental. The chief function of the woman's club has been educative. By

coöperating, women have disproved their traditional incapacity for group action; they have established a sure basis for successful advance. The lectures which they have attended at their clubs; the papers which they have heard, or which they have written and read; the occasional effort to participate in a Child Labor campaign or a municipal election; the committee or "section" meetings, taking in hand some specific topic, and, through investigation or study, aiming to master its difficulties,—these and a score of other activities have given club women a viewpoint that has led them to go into active reform campaigns. Out of the club with its break from tradition, and its atmosphere of progress have sprung the knowledge and the enthusiasm for effective work in many channels.

To be sure the educative influence of the woman's club was more largely needed in the past generation than it is today. The modern college girl enters the world with an assurance in her capacity to direct progress,—her mother, reared under the old régime, was not so confident of her prerogatives or her powers. She needed the woman's club.

No Child Labor Committee, no Social Workers' Club, no Street Cleaning or Tuberculosis campaign is organized today without women on its Board of Directors. At times the women are decidedly in the majority. The club sections or committees have done their work effectually. Women are so vitally interested in social and civic advance, that no social or

civic association can be successfully promoted without their active coöperation.

Tied to an everlasting grind of labor and drudgery, the women of a century ago were practically denied opportunity for coöperation. The factory system has given them leisure; the college has taught them to "pull together for the class"; leisure and training have supplied society with an immense unused power,—women, the "untried social force." We know approximately what men will do. They have demonstrated both their attitude and their capacity. Of woman's power, we know little. For untold ages they have worked individually—that is, ineffectively. Now, for the first time in the history of western civilization, they are combining in groups, and making demands. What will these groups do? Where will their demands end?

What is the social significance of women's organizations? The clubs have educated; the civic associations have agitated; the suffrage associations have demanded; and the trade unions have struck. That is nothing. These results have made little real impress in our time,—they have had scarcely any lasting influence. Stop! They have altered the face of the future, not by what they have accomplished, but by what they promise. A century ago man might, in all justice, decide that women had no organizing power. Today women have demonstrated their capacity for organization. You grope about a dark room at night, you search, upset,—at last your hand touches a match. Have you a light? No, but you have the means of

securing one. The women have found the means, coöperation, to the end, organized activity,—an end which will place them in full control of a boundless future.

The women of today are trained through organization; they are moulding the environment through their coöperative activity; they have leisure, they feel the power, they promise to perform far more in the near future than they have performed in the past; and highest of all, they, as unionists, or club women, who have spent a part of their lives in learning what can be accomplished through the power of unified action, will teach their children the value of coöperation.

CHAPTER XXX

POLITICAL STATUS OF WOMEN

For ages women have been political nonentities. So complete was their subjection, in fact, that their political non-existence was neither commented on nor questioned. Unlike the Twentieth-Century suffragette, they accepted their fate in silence.

Yet in times past, women have been more or less important politically. Their position and rights under the old Roman law were far superior to those under the early régime of Christianity, and in some respects to those in mediæval England and the Continent. According to the Roman law from Augustus to Justinian, 27 B. C.-527 A. D., every Roman woman was under masculine superintendence during her life. But the power of the guardian, whether father, husband, or some other male relative, had become very slight by the third century, Ulpian tells us. The reasons given for establishing this guardianship indicate very clearly the prevailing opinion of woman's nature and her unfitness for political power. According to Ulpian it was because of her "unsteadiness of character" and the "weakness of the sex."

Yet there is no doubt but that ample provision was made for the education of women. Pliny in the

Panegyricus makes the following statement: "In the numerous provisions for the public education at the state's expense, girls were given the same opportunities and privileges as boys." Women, moreover, had complete control of their dowries, and a widow could be appointed legal guardian of her own children. Although women had no vote, they were apparently allowed free public expression of opinion: Juvenal gives us many instances of a woman's pleading in public.

Woman's gradual approach to political recognition received a check under the early Christian Church. St. Paul had forbidden women to be heard, or even seen in public places and his behests received even too literal an application. The Christianizing of the Roman world therefore involved the re-subjection of women.

Among the Germanic tribes woman occupied a position of supreme importance politically; their opinions were heard with great reverence; they participated in the councils; held property; and were in every way equal to men. Tacitus tells of cases where a woman was ruler of a tribe. But as the Goths and Franks and other Teutonic tribes gradually came under the influence of the Christian church, they assigned to women a more and more subject position.

The struggle of women for political equality may be said to have begun in England toward the end of the eighteenth century. Not only was woman a nonentity politically, but she was legally disabled so as really

to hinder the performance of her duties and functions as a human being. Even as a mother, she had no power over her own children and was always subject to moderate correction by her husband at his discretion. While her power over property was far less than that under the Roman law, she suffered especial hardship from the laws regulating marriage. Stung by the many injustices to which they were subject, women began toward the end of the eighteenth century seriously to discuss their disabilities. In 1792 Mary Wollstonecraft published her "Vindication of the Rights of Women" and Harriet Martineau soon after began writing on the subject of political equality.

That the public generally had really begun to consider the question of woman's rights, is indicated by the careful exclusion of women from the franchise under the Reform Act of 1832. "Male persons" were carefully designated as constituting the electorate instead of, as previously, "persons." John Stuart Mill, elected to Parliament in 1856, was the first to bring the matter before the body. Since that time, by successive acts, Englishwomen have secured the vote at municipal elections, county council elections and parish and district council elections. In 1907, they were made eligible for the offices of mayor, alderman, and county and town councilors. At present, the women of England lack only parliamentary suffrage.

Almost parallel with the struggle for political equality in Great Britain has been that in the United States. The agitation began here in 1828 with the visit of

a Scotch woman,—Frances Wright,—to the United States. The first Woman's Rights Convention, however, was not held until July, 1848, at Seneca Falls, New York.

The social sanction given to the suffrage movement is not so general in the United States as in Great Britain. Some of the bitterest opponents of the movement are the women themselves. The suffrage is therefore rather limited. Only six of the States have granted equal suffrage to women,—Wyoming 1869, Colorado 1893, Utah 1896, Idaho 1896, Washington 1910, and California 1911. School suffrage, however, has been granted in the following chronological order (beginning 1838), by Kentucky, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Colorado, New Hampshire, Oregon, Massachusetts, New York, Vermont, Nebraska, North and South Dakota, Montana, Arizona, New Jersey, Illinois, Connecticut, Delaware, Wisconsin, and Oklahoma. Kansas in 1887 granted women municipal suffrage, while tax paying women are permitted to vote on all questions submitted to tax payers in Montana 1887, Louisiana 1898, New York 1901 (on local taxation), Michigan 1908 (on local taxation).

The right to vote has proved an opportunity for men. In the first place it has democratized them. For centuries the right to rule was regarded as a divine right, God-given to the few and exercised by them because of this divine favor. Gradually this concept of the divine right of kings waned. Some kings endeavored

to govern who had apparently been forgotten in the distribution of divine favors. Such men were apparently cursed, not blessed. They were weak, vicious, insincere,—should they be allowed to rule simply because they had the "divine right"? Could Divine Authority make such mistakes? Obviously not.

So the spirit grew until the men who had not been divinely appointed to govern other men decided to govern themselves. Then there was a revolution,—such an event as the inhabitants of the American Colonies witnessed in 1776,—royal prerogatives were overthrown, and a democracy substituted.

This change from monarchical to democratic rule has not ushered in the millennium, but it has vastly improved the conditions of millions of human beings. The men who vote are matured. They take their places in the councils, and decide the policies of their governments.

Citizenship raises individual standards because with privileges come responsibilities,—responsibilities which impose a weight of duties and obligations. Democracy has meant for men an opportunity for the expression of opinion. It has opened a way for self development. Likewise it has opened a way for effective work. Social institutions were oppressive: the oppression was relieved; working conditions were impossible; democracy interfered; the vested interests were overbearing and grasping; they have been curbed; the government of the men by the men has broadened

and deepened the stream of social consciousness and Social Progress.

Now, another change is coming. The opportunity to express opinions on public questions,—the opportunity to vote,—is demanded by women as well as by men. Where the demand has been granted, women, as active citizens, have found wide opportunities for service.

The whole field of social legislation is open to women. Children need protection; prospective mothers must not be physically overtaxed by factory work; babies require pure milk; adults need unadulterated food; streets must be clean; water must be pure; sweatshops need inspection, and the City Fathers need more careful watching. The house of the body politic needs cleaning and setting to rights. There are innumerable opportunities all through society for effective social work,—work which must finally be done by women. In the home, they have proved, by centuries of conclusive experiments, that they understand best the methods of keeping things clean and tidy; that they know most intimately the true needs of the human being.

Here then is a great field for women in politics. Men have built the house. They have constructed modern coöperative society. To be sure, women have helped,—but the chief work has been done by the men. Now the time has come when people are really to live in the splendid mansion. Men have built it, but they have left it littered with the inevitable accumu-

lation of trash and rubbish. They are still pushing onward, and outward, planning and building. It is the women who realize the needs of a social house-cleaning,—who are demanding an opportunity for real social service in the state.

Democracy has educated and matured men; so it must educate and mature women. Democracy has given men an opportunity to express their individual opinions and preferences in connection with the society of which they are a part; it must perform the same service for women. Furthermore, there is a distinct field open to women,—the field of social legislation, which in the next fifty years will be the battle ground of Social Progress. Women will not revolutionize society with the ballot. Men did not revolutionize society, when they secured the right to vote. Woman's opportunity in this direction is not revolutionary, but distinctively social and educative.

In the communities where women have been granted suffrage, they have followed this line of action with remarkable persistence. After an analysis of conditions in seven localities where women have full suffrage—Finland, New Zealand, Colorado, Utah, Idaho, Wyoming and Washington, Helen L. Summer concludes that Colorado is more typical of American conditions than any of the others. She therefore discusses the Colorado situation in great detail.

The women of Colorado have had the privilege of voting since 1894, so that an analysis of the results of suffrage in Colorado should prove as conclusively as

any analogy can prove, what opportunities American women have through the franchise. Miss Summer concludes from her scientific and dispassionate study of suffrage in Colorado that—[1]

1. The better educated women have voted in larger proportions than the less educated women.
2. Certain advanced types of Legislation have been secured.
   a. For the protection of women and children.
   b. For social reform.
   c. For municipal reform.
3. The women of Colorado have been actively engaged in studying economics.

It seems a very insignificant list of achievements, perhaps, to the enthusiastic propagandist who has faithfully believed that a few years of equal suffrage would revolutionize a community; but it is a wonderfully optimistic picture of the opportunities for social reform that lie with the women of the United States through the use of the ballot.

The recent use of the recall by the women of Washington to voice the protest against undesirable conditions in municipal government; the election by the women of Denver, Colorado, of Judge Ben B. Lindsey, who was running independently against both political machines,—furnish two dramatic incidents in the

[1] "Equal Suffrage," Helen L. Summer, Ph.D., New York, Harper & Bros., 1909, Chapters VI and VII.

work of women at the polls. In Washington undesirable men were holding office; in Colorado a desirable man was running for office against fearful odds. In both cases the votes of women turned the tide for democracy.

These illustrations are striking, but incidental. It is the long years of persistent, tireless effort which really count in the movement for Social Progress. Such persistence and tirelessness has characterized the efforts of the women, first, in securing the ballot, then in exercising it for social betterment.

The franchise will give to all women the right to vote and hence the responsibility, when voting, of making wise decisions. The amount of time consumed each year in voting—half an hour or at most an hour for each election—is infinitesimally small compared with the far-reaching results which women may secure through the wise use of the franchise. If women hold their present ideals of social justice and civic standards, and maintain them through their exercise of the franchise, they may do in the United States what they have done in New Zealand,—force both political parties to nominate men of spotless reputation, and to conduct their administration in such a manner that social well-being is assured.

Citizenship, wisely exercised, presents one of the chief opportunities open to American women. The field is extensive and largely untried. In the states which have granted equal suffrage, there is already some indication of the power of women in political activity.

CHAPTER XXXI

WOMAN, AN ORGANIC SOCIAL FACTOR

THIS study began with a description of woman as an individual being with qualities, talents, and possibilities. The establishment of this fundamental fact immediately involves another concept of even greater importance than the first,—that is, if woman is an independent, capable being, she necessarily assumes a place in the social structure. Woman is therefore not only an individual, but she is also an organic part of a society, which in a measure, depends for its existence upon her contribution to the future.

Women have capacity; in the future they will have wider opportunities for the development of this capacity; hence, upon them devolves certain responsibilities for racial and social advance.

Racially, "woman is nature's supreme instrument of the future." They not only play a large part in the selection of fathers for their children, but, in addition they bear the future generation in their own bodies. "I selected my wife," says the man, proudly, "and then I married her." If he stated the matter accurately he must say, "We selected each other, my wife and I, and then we were married." In any case the woman has a partial selective choice, so that her decision, as well

as that of her husband, determines who shall be the parents of the new generation. Selection is a basic factor in progress. No single element in the national life goes so far in determining the characteristics of the future.

In a primitive society, where a high birth rate must be maintained to offset the high death rate due to war, pestilence and famine, all of the emphasis is laid on bearing children. In such a society, large families are looked upon as proofs of exalted patriotism, even though the unfortunate victims, women and children alike, are destroyed by the million in the process. But society has advanced to the point of demanding quality before quantity. "It is far more essential," maintains the modern philosopher, "that we bring up a few children well, than that we bring into the world a great mass of humanity to maintain a precarious existence, or to die at an early age." It is not enough that parents mate wisely: something more is demanded than that children be well born. To be sure, both of these things are essential and fundamental, but wise mating and good birth cannot be converted into efficiency and inspiration in the absence of able training. Besides being well born, children must be well trained, and it is the women who will do the training.

This is a second social function of the most fundamental concern to women,—she must not only bear the children but, she must also rear them. In the home their entire training devolves upon the mother; in the schools they are cared for almost exclusively by

women teachers. Abraham Lincoln once said that all that he was or ever hoped to be he owed to his mother. Aside from any native capacity which he may have derived from his father, Lincoln unquestionably owed what he was to his mother.

In so far, therefore, as the child is shaped by the environment of the first fourteen years of life, he is shaped largely, sometimes altogether, by his mother and his teachers. To-day men are doing the work for which the women of the last generation prepared them. While they are building bridges, and cities, the women are at work on human clay, which will be moulded into the bridge- and city-builders of the future.

The preservation of the home is one of the chief ideals of the Anglo-Saxons. Among them the home is still the central unit of society, having functions to perform for which no other social institution has thus far been devised. Women are the rulers of the home, where they minister to the most intimate personal wants of the family.

Then too, women are the spenders,—the final arbiters of national consumption. By their decision they determine whether the manufacturer shall produce oatmeal or corn flakes; whether beans shall be baked at home or canned in a factory; whether the manufacture of clothing shall be carried forward in vile tenements, or in sanitary establishments. As spenders, women hold the whip hand of the industrial world. Did they choose to organize their demands and make them felt through judicious spending, they could eliminate food

adulteration and sweated labor, raise the standard of quality of all manufactured products, and determine the future status of American industry.

Thus women hold a strategic position in society. By the choice of parents; by the bearing and rearing of the children; by child training at home and in school; by their control of the central social unit, the home; and by their control of the purse-strings of the nation, women may play a leading rôle in the drama of Social Progress. That they have already availed themselves of some of their opportunities is obvious; that they will have even more extended opportunities in the future is equally certain. Woman is an organic social force of the first magnitude. As such, she must be reckoned with, since, with the awakening to the possibilities of her situation, she will exercise her powers to reshape civilized society.

In addition to her strictly social functions, woman will each year take a greater share in industry. Certain industrial functions requiring dexterity and perseverance are hers of right. Women will play a part in industry, a part of growing importance. Here, as well as in the social field, they constitute a vital, organic factor. Here, as there, women will help to shape the future.

There is one other field open for women. They will, they must be the house-cleaners of civilization. This house cleaning, which, in modern parlance, is called "Social Work," will fall primarily to the lot of women.

How helpless is a man in the home when the women are away! The dishes pile up; litter accumulates; neatness and order disappear. With the woman return order and cleanliness! Housekeeping has begun again.

Genius has been defined as "the capacity for taking infinite pains." If the definition holds, woman is a genius, for she does infinitely well those small things about the house which make up the perfect work of the whole.

Woman is the housekeeper, and man has abandoned to her that work and betaken himself to the world of affairs, which he has proceeded to clutter up with odds and ends of every description. Graft lies about, thick as dust; iniquitous statutes clog the wheels of progress; indifference collects everywhere. Bad water, adulterated food, child labor, antiquated penal codes, vice and debauchery in public affairs,—all pay eloquent tribute to the unrestricted masculine dominance of social institutions. The world of affairs is in obvious need of a thorough house cleaning.

Here is an apparent and urgent need for the hand of woman. The city and state, as well as the home, need cleaning. In this field, too, woman is advancing to the front and assuming control. Through philanthropy, clubs, civic organizations, and political activity, women have begun a national house cleaning, again demonstrating their integral connection with Social Progress. If initiation is primarily a function of men, completion seems to be an equally important

function of women. Who shall say that the harrow and the seeder are less essential than the plough?

Whether she take her part in social affairs as an individual, or as one unit in a great coöperating group, woman is an organic element in social advance. Racially, socially, individually, and politically she plays a part which is peculiarly her own,—a part upon which the nation is intimately dependent for its future citizens and its future society.

CHAPTER XXXII

WOMEN AND THE FUTURE

In the future, as in the present, woman will be an integral factor in Social Progress, securing more influence and power with each succeeding generation. But neither influence nor power will be given her—she must take it. You cannot teach a child,—the child must learn; no more can you free a slave,—the slave must free himself. So with woman,—she must herself learn what her rights are, and must then demand them in no uncertain terms. Have women a right to organize clubs and absent themselves from home? Have they a right to vote? Should they enter industry? Should they play a part in the constructive life of the nation? Neither organization, franchise, industrial positions or constructive social life will be thrust upon women. If they want these things, they must get them.

And women are getting them. Slowly the realization of their independence has dawned upon them. Uncertainly at first, then more firmly and boldly they have asserted their rights. We are now in a transition stage.

"The place of woman," cries the opponent of her advance, "is in the home."

"Why, may we ask?"

"Well, because she has always been there."

Yes, but now she is going to leave it, at least for a portion of her time. The pulsing, living world calls her. Already the father, brother and husband have heeded the call and left the home. One by one the home industries have followed them, until woman, stripped of her former home responsibilities, stands on the threshold of a new life in which, "The past material conditions of life have gone forever; no will of man can recall them, but *this* is our demand: We demand that, in that strange new world that is arising alike upon man and woman, where nothing is as it was and all things are assuming new shapes and relations, that in this new world, we also shall have our share of honored and socially useful human toil. . . . We demand nothing more than this, and we will take nothing less. This is our WOMAN'S RIGHT!"[1]

Certain principles regarding woman's future activity, may, however, be laid down as determined. Among the first of these is the fundamental law of democratic society that there are no rights without duties; that only the slave is free to do as he will; that freedom carries with it the constant responsibility of choice. Woman's emancipation must come, but with it will come also the burden of deciding what she shall do with her newly acquired liberty, which, cannot, under any interpretation, be construed into license.

[1] "Woman and Labor," Olive Schreiner, New York, F. A. Stokes Co., 1911, p. 65.

Women must have freedom, but they must, with the privileges of freedom, accept also its duties.

That women recognize the exigencies of the matter, that they are alive to the importance of the situation, all of the data at hand would indicate. College trained, or trained by college women, the educated girls of the new generation are coming forward and facing the problems with which they are confronted. The study of eugenics has taught them that racially the future rests mainly upon their shoulders; that they must select, and that, on their selection, the progress of the race depends. They are learning, scientifically, the problems of domestic science; they have gained wisdom in spending as an essential element in their training. The unit of organized society—the home—is theirs to reconstruct or to consign to oblivion. They see the problem clearly in the light of modern scientific knowledge, and are hastening to master it. These women are likewise assuming their educational responsibilities. In the home as well as in the school, they are training children for citizenship; for civic endeavor; for industrial activity; for fundamental right thinking; for the kind of manhood and womanhood which alone constitute the essence of the Republic.

Already, the women of America are accomplishing these things. To achieve their ends,—to fit themselves and the future for the work of the world, these pioneers are organizing; preëmpting the ballot with which to make their demands emphatic, and then declaring, before the dying generation, that the women

of the new generation will be free,—free through their own efforts.

The thinking women of the present generation have agreed on emancipation. The stand is eminently justifiable because, if the women of the future are to be worthy mothers of noble children, and, if they are to participate in social movements, they must have,—

1. Effective self development.
2. Ability and freedom to choose life activities.
3. A wise concept of the use of leisure time.

Effective self development should include a strong body, a good training in physiology and hygiene, and a rounded ability to take a place in the world and fill it well. The city woman's physical disability is the culmination of misdirected training, begun early in youth. There is no justification for denying to girls the physical development provided for boys; for making them weaklings before the age when there is any physical differentiation due to sex development.

Back of the physical training which makes the girl of ten the equal, physically, of her brother of ten, should be a thorough education in hygiene and physiology. The effects of alcohol and tobacco are of little interest to a girl of ten, but the construction of her body and the proper care of it are of exceedingly great value to her; hence she should secure self knowledge as an integral part of her education.

Every normal being should engage in some form of constructive occupation. The woman is no exception,

and her education should in the future include not only effective physical development and an adequate training in self knowledge, but also a training that will enable her to fill some position in life. Life in the home should develop sympathy and a desire for co-operation; education should furnish a basis for a broad viewpoint; and occupation should afford an opportunity for the development of character.

Home life is narrowing and unless supplemented by education leads to life in "social sets" so disastrous to the development of individuality. Even education is not effective in the development of character unless it is applied in the form of some positive occupation.

It is upon this question of occupation that it is necessary to lay particular emphasis, because the impression prevails among a group of present-day American women that if their husbands are able to earn enough to support them in idleness it is neither necessary nor fitting for them to engage in any form of occupation. There could be no more dangerous or disastrous fallacy.

Generally speaking, it is true that "Satan finds some mischief still for idle hands to do," and the person who is chronically idle may well become chronically mischievous. Each life should represent some achievement. Character makes for achievement; achievement makes for character. It is unnecessary to emphasize the fact that physical faculties decay with disuse. The faculties which make up character fall in the same category. If they are used, they develop; if they are

unused, they decay. Occupation furnishes the readiest use of the faculties composing character, and the test of effectiveness is their use in achievement.

Therefore, of all of the training which should make up the education of the women of the future, none is so important as the training which will enable her to choose her occupation wisely. Some occupation she should have, the nature of which can be determined only by her special aptitudes.

There are two alternative occupations open to women,—first, motherhood, and second, some form of constructive pursuit, usually industrial. Neither occupation is exclusive of the other and most women should, at different periods of their lives, engage in both of them. Motherhood, whether viewed from the standpoint of society or of the woman personally, is by far the more important occupation of the two. As motherhood necessarily implies bearing children, it implies rearing them as well. It is far more important for a woman to bear two children and bring them up well than to bear ten children and let them grow like Topsy.

But child bearing should be stringently limited to women who possess good health and an income sufficient to rear a family properly. Motherhood should be prohibited to any woman suffering from a transmissible physical defect, like feeble-mindedness, epilepsy or syphilis. Neither should a chronic pauper be permitted to bring into the world children for whom there is no apparent means of support. Thus, the

woman who chooses motherhood should be physically fitted to bear children, and mentally and financially capable of rearing them.

Both heredity and environment, however, are dependent upon the father as well as the mother. Perhaps the most important decision which a woman must make prior to motherhood is involved in her choice of a husband. Every effort is bent toward the training of men for the careful selection of an occupation, and the successful pursuit of it, but for the girl in the choice of a father for her children, no training whatever is provided, not even in the literature which is placed in her hands during her early years. The woman of the future must understand first that the choice is important; and second, that the three chief elements which should determine choice are,—good physical health, ability and compatibility.

It seems scarcely necessary to point to the fact that education, viewpoint and aims in life make up the substance of the compatibility which is such a vital factor in the well organized home.

Motherhood, the first alternative occupation for women, should be accepted by women as a duty due to society, the fulfillment of which should be a responsibility felt by all, particularly by the women best fitted, because of ability and income, to rear the children of the next generation.

The world of constructive activity presents the second alternative occupation open to women. Arts and crafts originated with women and were at one time

performed by them. Never was industry calling more loudly for efficiency than it calls today and it makes its call particularly effective because the increasing specialization of the past few decades has afforded scores of openings in newly developing industries. These positions furnish a ready outlet for the energies and capacities of the woman who expects to marry, but who finds two or three unoccupied years between her and matrimony.

If compatibility in the home is to be assured, every woman should, before she marries, or immediately afterward, come in contact with the active world, because of the breadth of view which such a contact affords. Perfect sympathy in the home can be assured only when the woman understands the problems which confront her husband, and she can understand them intelligently only after some contact with the world of affairs. The woman who spends her life in the same "social set" atrophies. Furthermore, society needs the active, efficient coöperation of every member if its highest welfare is to be assured.

There are five groups of women who should always engage in some form of constructive occupation—first, girls between the end of their schooling and their marriage. The average girl stops school at fifteen or sixteen and the average age of marriage for a woman is twenty-three or twenty-four. She should employ the intervening eight years productively. As there is little profitable work in the home for such a girl, the

years should be filled in with some form of industrial occupation.

Second—women who are suffering from any transmissible disease or defect should be denied absolutely the privileges of motherhood, and should, therefore, spend their adult lives in some form of occupation.

In the third place, women who are geniuses,—perhaps there is one in ten thousand,—the social value of whose careers would be lessened by motherhood, should continue their chosen vocation. Women of such rare ability are, however, peculiarly fitted for motherhood and they should weigh carefully the social value of their motherhood against the social value of their career. In most cases the balance would undoubtedly result in the motherhood plus the career.

Fourth, that large group of young wives who, during the first two or three years of wifehood have no children, should by all means begin or continue some productive occupations, principally, as Dr. Patten has pointed out, because of the needed addition to the husband's income, but also for self development.

In the fifth place, able-bodied women who in middle life send their last child to college and have no exacting duties in the home, should take up some occupation and keep pace with the world.

"That Mary is no longer merely the down quilt about John's manly form when he comes home cold and tired is partly because 'he needs her in his business' as a citizen. Society has become aware of duties which women can perform better than men. The race-family

stands in as great need of feminine as of masculine judgment and action. Mother's table-talk is far more important than mother's doughnuts and pies. Mother must chaperon her daughters and keep step with her sons, whether their stockings are darned or not."[1]

The girl before marriage, the defective woman, geniuses, young wives, and women who have raised families, should all take a part in the world of occupation and should all be so trained that when they do take such a position, their work may be efficient.

The future calls the women of the United States to participate in the efforts to secure Social Progress. With capacity, training and opportunity, they may play a unique part in the development of the new civilization. As society reshapes its activities, women must choose "between finding new forms of labor or sinking slowly into a condition of more or less complete and passive sex-parasitism."[2] That they are choosing the "new forms of labor" is evinced on every hand by the broadening field of woman's activity.

From every quarter come voices of encouragement and hope. "Morgan has remarked that the fall of classic civilizations was due to the failure to develop women. . . . The hope of our future civilization lies in the development of equal freedom of both the masculine and feminine elements in life."[3]

[1] "Our House in Order," J. E. Robb, *Outlook*, June 18, 1910, p. 355.

[2] "Woman and Labor," Olive Schreiner, New York, F. A. Stokes Co., 1911, p. 75.

[3] "Man and Woman," H. Ellis, London, W. Scott, 1897, p. 396.

Yet "throughout all human history woman has been powerfully discriminated against and held down by custom, law, literature and public opinion."[1] How encouraging then are the words of G. Stanley Hall, "Biologic psychology already dreams of a new philosophy of sex which places the wife and mother at the heart of a new world and makes her the object of a new religion."[2]

The Nineteenth Century has been described as "Woman's Century." In the Twentieth, "the dawn is breaking for womanhood and therefore for all mankind,"[3] and men and women are coöperating for the advancement of society.

If woman is to mean all that she may well mean in the future, she must realize that occupation, achievement and character are a triune which complement each other and make for the highest and best in life. She must realize her own possibilities and see in them a measure of the potentiality which is expressing itself in Social Evolution and Progress.

[1] "Pure Sociology," Lester F. Ward, New York, The Macmillan Co., 1903, p. 377.

[2] "Adolescence," G. Stanley Hall, New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1908, Vol. II, p. 646.

[3] "Woman and Womanhood," C. W. Saleeby, New York, Kennerley, 1911, p. 392.

INDEX

ABILITY:
  Inheritance of, 156-159.
ALTRUISM:
  In woman, 25-26.
AMERICAN WOMAN:
  Choices of, 137-139.
  Dilemma of, V.
  Opportunities of, 138-144.
  Position of, I.

CHILD TRAINING:
  In the home, 196-204.
COLLEGE EDUCATION:
  For women, 106-110.
COLLEGE WOMEN:
  Activities of, 273-274.
  In social work, 244-247.
CONSUMER:
  Power of, 174-176.
CONSUMER'S LEAGUE:
  Possibilities of, 175-176.
CO-OPERATION:
  Development in Education, 214-215.
  Effect on the home, 42-44.
  On industry, 42-44.
  Opportunity of women for, 253-255.
  Power of, 214-215.
CUSTOM:
  In the United States, 56.

DEFECT:
  Inheritance of, 156-159.
DIET:
  Elements of, 179-181.
DOMESTIC REVOLUTION:
  Effect on the home, 42-44.
DOMESTIC SCIENCE:
  Character of, 177-178.
  Factors in, 178-180.
DOMESTIC SERVANTS:
  Demands on, 189-193.
  Number and character of, 187-189.
  Position of, 192-195.
DOMESTIC SYSTEM:
  And apprenticeship, 35-36.
  Character of, 34-37.
  Character of home under, 47.
  In England, 35-36.
  In United States, 36-37.
  Replacement of, 40-41.

EDUCATION:
  Character of, 205-210.
  For Professions, 115-121.
  Modern, 205-210.
  School training, 205-210.
ENVIRONMENT:
  Effect on the Child, 266-267.
EQUAL SUFFRAGE:
  Advantage of, 262-264.
  History of development, 258-261.
  Results, 262-263.

FACTORY SYSTEM:
  Effect on woman's work, 52-53.
FASHION:
  Result of tradition, 60-63.
FEMALE:
  Biologic dominance of, 13-15.
  Primary nature of, 12-14.
  Selective power of, 164-167.
FOOD values, 181-184.

GIRLS:
  College education of, 106-110.
  Education of, 90-96.
    Ideal, 99-101; 104-105.
    Problems in, 99-104.
  Proper education for, 90-95.

HEREDITY:
  New theory of, 147-150.
HOME:
  And child training, 196-199.
  Character of modern, 45-47.
  Effects of domestic revolution, 42-4.

Loss of economic functions, 44-46.
New basis for, 47-48.
HYGIENE:
Training in, 93-94.

INDIVIDUAL:
And the social group, 3.
Development, 2.
INDUSTRIAL REVOLUTION:
And division of labor, 38-39.
Cause of, 37-39
Effects of:
On the home, 40-41.
On production, 37-38.
INDUSTRY:
And woman's work, 218-219.
Standardization of, 218-219.

LEISURE:
Effects on work, 49-50.
For modern women, 53-55.
Meaning of, 49.
LIFE:
Female, 12-14.
Origin of, 12-14.

MAN AND WOMAN:
Comparison of, 7-9.
Division of labor, between, 35.
Methods of reasoning, 23-24.
Physical capacity, 18-19.
Power of, 24-25.
Primitive society, 35.
Selective power of, 167-170.
Thought in, 22-23.
Training of, 89-91.
Variations in, 16.
MANHATTAN TRADE SCHOOL:
Success of, 126-127.
MAN'S sphere, 111.
MARRIAGE:
And propagation, 78-79.
Financial side of, 84.
Husband hunting, 81-82.
Practical side of, 79-80.
Prerequisites, 82-83.
Trade, nature of, 78-82.
Effects on women, 85-87.

MASCULINE DOMINANCE, 5-7.
In literature, 75-77.
Primitive society, 69-72.
Prostitution, 72-75.
Tradition of, 75-77.
MORALITY:
Double standard of, 71-73; 113-114.
MOTHERHOOD:
As an occupation, 276-277.
MOTHER'S helpers, 194-195.

NATURAL selection, 149-152.

OCCUPATIONS:
New alignment of, 128-130.
OPPORTUNITY:
As a basis for achievement, 29-31.

PARENTHOOD:
Duties of, 199-203.
Education for, 169-170.
Importance of, 169-170.
PHILANTHROPY:
Problems of, 242-244.
PROGRESS:
Education as an element in, 215-216.
PROSTITUTION:
Historically, 73-74.
In modern society, 74.
PURITANISM:
In the American Colonies, 138-140.
In early Rome, 130-132.

RACE:
Type, 11-12; 14-16.
Woman and, 11-12; 14-16.
RELIGION:
And woman's political status, 256-257.
ROME:
Women in, 130-136.
SELECTION:
Artificial, 151-154.
The female as a factor in, 164-167.

In human society, 154-158.
Importance of, 147-150; 276-277.
Reversed, 158-159.
And sexual attraction, 168.
Woman as a factor in, 161-165.

SERVANT PROBLEM:
Character of, 189-192.
SEX EDUCATION:
Necessity for, 93-94; 103-105.
SOCIAL TRADITIONS:
Effect on Women, 57-62.
SOCIAL WORK:
College women in, 244-247.
Proportions of men and women in, 244-246.
SPENDING:
Education for, 174-176.
A new function for women, 172-174.
SYMPATHY:
In woman, 24-25.

TRADITION:
Effects on women, 63-67.
Religious, 63-67.

WOMAN:
Achievement, 29-31.
Capacity for, 29-31, 33, 269-270.
Capacity, biologic, 10-14.
Characteristics of, 1.
College education, 106-110.
Conservatism of, 16.
Domestic service for, 187-189.
In early Rome, 129-132.
Public life of, 133-135.
Effect of idleness on, 144-146.
Endurance of, 20-21.
Evolutionary position of, 16-17.
And fashion, 60-63.
And the future, 280-281.
An individual, 3.
Industrial activities of, 278-280.
Industrial work of:
Prerequisites, 238.
In industry, historically, 122-124.
In modern industry, 123,125, 217-224.
In primitive industry, 35.
Insight of, 25-27.
Inspirational power of, 26-28.
Intellectual capacity of, 19, 22, 24.
Intellectualization of, 109-112.
Longevity of, 20-21.
And marriage, 79-85.
Moral Subjection, 71-74.
Needs of, 274-276.
And the new generation, 11.
New leisure for, 53-55.
Occupations before, 276-279.
Opportunity of, 21-23, 31-33.
In education, 205-216.
In the home, 196-204.
In modern industry, 225-230.
In organization, 246-250.
Modern society, 267, 269.
Philanthropy, 241-247.
Social legislation, 261-262.
In specific employments, 231,239.
As spenders, 171-176.
Physical capacity of, 18-19.
Place of:
The home, 11.
Political status of, 256-263.
Power in the future, 269,270, 280-281.
Real nature of, 85.
Sacrifice of wives, 69-70.
School training of, 97-103.
Selective power of, 162-170.
Social positions:
Effects of religion on, 64-66.

And social progress, 280-281.
Specialization of, 14-16.
Sphere of, 70-75.
Subjection of, 4-6.
  Child marriage, 70-71.
  Home training, 88-93.
Subserviency to man, 76-77.
Sympathy of, 24-25.
Traditional status of, 66-67.
Tradition of obedience, 57-58.
Training of:
  For professions, 115-131.
Unskilled status of, 125-126.
Work of:
  Domestic system, 52.
  Primitive society, 51-52.
Vitality of, 20-21.
WOMAN'S COLLEGE:
Advantages of, 112-114.
Development of, 107-111.
Woman's sphere, III.
WOMEN'S ORGANIZATIONS:
Opportunities of, 250-254.

THE following pages contain advertisements of Macmillan books by the same author and on kindred subjects.

American Social Progress Series

EDITED BY

PROFESSOR SAMUEL McCUNE LINDSAY, PH.D., LL.D.,

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

A series of handbooks for the student and general reader, giving the results of the newer social thought and of the recent scientific investigations of the facts of American social life and institutions. Each volume about 200 pages.

1—The New Basis of Civilization. By SIMON N. PATTEN, PH.D., LL.D., University of Pennsylvania. *Price, $1.00 net.*

2—Standards of Public Morality. By ARTHUR TWINING HADLEY, Ph.D., LL.D., President of Yale University. *Price, $1.00 net.*

3—Misery and Its Causes. By EDWARD T. DEVINE, Ph.D., LL.D., Columbia University. *Price, $1.25 net.*

4—Government Action for Social Welfare. By JEREMIAH W. JENKS, Ph.D., LL.D., Cornell University. *Price, $1.00 net.*

5—Social Insurance. A Program of Social Reform. By HENRY ROGERS SEAGER, Ph.D., Columbia University. *Price, $1.00 net.*

6—The Social Basis of Religion. By SIMON N. PATTEN, Ph.D., LL.D., University of Pennsylvania. *Price, $1.25 net.*

7—Social Reform and the Constitution. By FRANK J. GOODNOW, LL.D., Columbia University. *Cloth, 12mo, $1.50 net.*

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers 64-66 Fifth Avenue New York

BOOKS OF KINDRED INTEREST

ADDAMS, JANE. Newer Ideals of Peace

Miss Addams points out that in the growth of the moral sense of the nations the goal of universal peace will be reached through the co-operation of the very elements now regarded as disturbers—the immigrant population in the large cities. She discusses the Labor Movement; the protection of women and children; "Women in City Government," etc., etc.

18+243 pages, 12mo, cloth, leather back
Citizen's Library, $1.25 net

Wage-Earning Women

By ANNIE MARION MacLEAN, Professor of Sociology in Adelphi College

Cloth, leather back, 12mo, $1.25 net; by mail, $1.35

This book needed to be written. Society has to be reminded that the prime function of women must ever be the perpetuation of the race. It can be so reminded only by a startling presentation of the woman who is 'speeded up' on a machine, the woman who breaks records in packing prunes or picking hops, the woman who outdoes all others in vamping shoes or spooling cotton. . . . The chapters give glimpses of women wage-earners as they toil in different parts of the country. The author visited the shoeshops, and the paper, cotton, and woollen mills of New England, the department stores of Chicago, the garment-makers' homes in New York, the silk mills and potteries of New Jersey, the fruit farms of California, the coal fields of Pennsylvania, and the hop industries of Oregon. The author calls for legislation regardless of constitutional quibble, for a shorter work-day, a higher wage, the establishment of residential clubs, the closer cooperation between existing organizations for industrial betterment."—*Boston Advertiser.*

Making Both Ends Meet:

The Income and Outlay of New York Working Girls

By SUE AINSLEE CLARK and EDITH WYATT

Illustrated, cloth, 12mo, 270 pages, $1.50 net; by mail $1.60

The girl who, without friends or home, is obliged to earn her living in a big city, faces a very real problem. Various phases of this problem have been dealt with by philanthropic, social and religious workers and writers, but the solution is seemingly as far away as ever. Though there are many homes and organizations of a semi-charitable nature in all our large cities, these really can care for and watch over but a small per cent of the working girl population. Those who for one reason or another do not come within the radius of these institutions must shift entirely for themselves. These are the subjects of Mrs. Clark and Miss Wyatt's book.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
Publishers 64-66 Fifth Avenue New York

AN UNUSUALLY INTERESTING BOOK

The Book of Woman's Power

WITH AN INTRODUCTION BY IDA M. TARBELL

Decorated cloth, 16mo, $1.25 net; by mail, $1.35
Also in limp leather, $1.75 net; by mail, $1.85

"Whether the reader favors votes for women or not, 'The Book of Woman's Power' will make a particular appeal to all interested in that subject."—*Ohio State Journal.*

"It is a well-made book; the purpose of it is uplifting, and the contents are certainly of the highest class. It is a book good to read, and full of instruction for every one who wishes to pursue this theme."—*Salt Lake Tribune.*

MISS MOLLY ELLIOT SEAWELL'S

The Ladies' Battle

Cloth, 12mo, $1.00 net; by mail $1.10

"Her reasoning is clear and the arguments she presents are forcibly put . . . a racy little book, logical and convincing."—*Boston Globe.*

"The book is one which every woman, whatever her views, ought to read. It has no dull pages."—*Record-Herald,* Chicago.

"Miss Seawell treats a subject of universal interest soberly and intelligently. She deserves to be widely read."—*Boston Daily Advertiser.*

"The clearest and the most thorough little treatise on the theme of woman suffrage."—*Chicago Inter-Ocean.*

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
Publishers 64-66 Fifth Avenue New York

By SCOTT NEARING, Ph.D.
Of the Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania

Social Adjustment

Cloth, 377 pages, $1.50 net.

"It is a good book, and will help any one interested in the study of present social problems."—*Christian Standard.*

"A clear, sane gathering together of the sociological dicta of to-day. Its range is wide—education, wages, distribution and housing of population, conditions of women, home decadence, tenure of working life and causes of distress, child labor, unemployment, and remedial methods. A capital reading book for the million, a text-book for church and school, and a companion for the economist of the study desk."—*Book News Monthly.*

Wages in the United States

Cloth, 12mo, $1.25 net.

This work represents an examination of statistics offered by various states and industries in an effort to determine the average wage in the United States. As a scholarly and yet simple statement it is a valuable contribution to the study of one side of our social organization.

Economics

By SCOTT NEARING and FRANK D. WATSON
Both Instructors in Political Economy in the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, University of Pennsylvania. *Cloth, 8vo, 493 pages, $1.90 net.*

This book discusses the whole subject of prosperity of the factors which enter into the complex economic life of the nation. A young man who wishes to read even the daily paper with full intelligence would find time spent in reading this book well employed for the help which it would give him in understanding current discussions of such topics as the standard of living; the natural resources of the country and their conservation; the relations of labor and immigration; of the labor of women and children to industrial progress; of organization in business and its tendencies; of the growth and functions of large corporations; of public ownership; of the various experiments which have been tried at different times, or the programmes which social leaders are now proposing for the remedy or the prevention of economic injustice.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY
Publishers 64-66 Fifth Avenue New York

By FRANCIS GREENWOOD PEABODY

The Approach to the Social Question

Cloth 12mo $1.25 net; by mail, $1.35

An Introduction to the Study of Social Ethics

"Like the City of God in the Book of Revelation, the Social Question lies four-square and toward each front leads a well-traveled road. Each of these four approaches to the social question has been trodden by many students and there are aspects of the social question which may be best seen from each of these converging roads. The first of these approaches is by the way of social science; the second is by the way of sociology; the third is by the way of economics; the fourth is by the way of ethics."

In this highly engaging manner the author sets forth the ways which lead to a philosophy of the Social Question as he sees them and then, by considering each one of these ways, he proceeds to a final recognition of the religious significance of the questions which are vexing the society of to-day.

By FLORENCE KELLEY

Ethical Gains Through Legislation

It is proposed to discuss in each of the four divisions of this book the gain arising from the legislation already achieved in the direction of recognizing and establishing the particular right named in the title; and also the gain remaining to be achieved—our American legislation being perhaps distinguished chiefly by its lack of uniformity. The main divisions of the book will be: (1) The Right to Childhood, (2) The Right to Leisure, (3) The Purchaser's Right to Knowledge, (4) The Right of Women to Vote.

THE MACMILLAN COMPANY

Publishers 64-66 Fifth Avenue New York

396 Nearing & Nearing
N35 Woman and social
progress

DATE	ISSUED TO
	Longfellow 103

396 RADCLIFFE COLLEGE
N35 The borrower is responsible for knowing when this book is due.
To avoid fines return books promptly.

Longfellow 103